

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXV.

BALTIMORE, JANUARY, 1910.

No. 1.

PROFESSOR KASTNER'S HYPOTHESIS.

After reading Professor Kastner's interesting coda to my article in the January *Modern Language Review*, I am certain that he is more sure of his position than I am of mine. And rightly, since he is saying but what we have all been taught from our childhood. So true is this that when Emil Koeppe—surely a great scholar—found the parallelism between the sonnets of Wyatt and Saint-Gelais, he assumed with but a slight caveat that he had found Wyatt's original. I am the one who is here the heretic. I question a theory so often stated that we think of it as fact. And I do not quite see how Professor Kastner has answered my question. In spite of the "numerous errors of fact or judgment"—it is tempting to deviate from the main issue to object here—¹ the situation has been left by Professor Kastner precisely where he found it. There are three sonnets by Sannazaro, Wyatt, and Saint-Gelais which are so similar in treatment as to preclude the idea that they all might have been written independently. We all agree that of the three Sannazaro's is the original. In the February number of *Modern Language Notes*, 1908,² I endeavored

¹ For example :

"Overlooking numerous errors of fact or judgment more particularly in the estimation of the part played by those poets who pointed the way to the Pléiade, we come to this equally audacious declaration : ' while the manner is undoubtedly absent, there is virtual agreement that Marot introduced the sonnet form.' . . . There is nothing to contradict Du Bellay's statement, and recent criticism is inclined to confirm it." Kastner, *M. L. R.*, Vol. iv, pp. 252-3.

"Marot, le premier en France, fit des sonnets." Joseph Vianey—*Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e Siècle*, Montpellier, 1909, 9. 102.

In a note Vianey adds: "C'est ce qu'a établi M. H. Vaganay dans le *Sonnet en Italie et en France au XVI^e siècle*" (1).

²As a matter of fact both of us were anticipated by Mr. Arthur Tilley. *Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, Vol. v, p. 149.

to show that from internal evidence the Saint-Gelais was taken from the Wyatt. In the April number of *Modern Language Review* of the same year Professor Kastner had also found the Sannazaro, but attributed the Saint-Gelais to him. He added a note referring to my article, stating his disbelief in my attribution on *a priori* grounds. My next attempt, then, was to show that on *a priori* grounds it was not impossible that *Petrarchismo* reached England before it reached France. This I believe I have done.

The situation then is this. Three sonnets exist of which we know nothing concerning the origin, motive or circumstances. The dates of publication give us no aid since, altho the Sannazaro was published for the first time as late as 1531, his *Rime* is usually dated 1480-1504 ; since, altho Wyatt's did not appear until 1557, Wyatt died in 1542 ; and as since, altho Saint-Gelais may have published a volume as early as 1547, Vaganay dates a sonnet of his in 1544. Granting that the Sannazaro be the original, the problem is to account for the other two. The problem is made still more perplexing from the fact that this sonnet is the only one yet identified that Wyatt took from any author but Petrarch, and the only sonnet published in the Saint-Gelais volume of 1547. Nor is the sonnet itself, aside from its literary history, of any literary value. Professor Kastner argues that both writers translated independently. He is led to this conclusion from the undoubted ignorance of English literature on the part of French authors, and he explains the coincidence on the ground that, as both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais were influenced by Serafino, that is, they were Quattrocentistic—he will pardon my use of this ugly word—they chose this sonnet out of all the other sonnets of Sannazaro because it is in that manner, that is, it is not characteristic of Sannazaro. "In choosing the sonnet in question from among those of Sannazaro rather than any other both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais remained

true to one side at least of their natural bent. Its exaggerated metaphors and strained hyperboles single it out from the rest of Sannazaro's sonnets. Serafino, Tebaldeo, or Pamfilo Sasso, that apt pupil of theirs, might have written it. The central idea is identically the same as in the following strambotto of Serafino." (He quotes here the strambotto, where the central idea is similar tho scarcely identical.)³ "Though I do not wish to exaggerate the importance of what may only be a coincidence, it almost looks as if Sannazaro who was friendly with Cariteo, the precursor of the group, and with Tebaldeo, had one day wished to show his friends that he could, if he so desired, hold his own with them on their own ground. There were special reasons why this particular sonnet of Sannazaro should have appealed to Saint-Gelais and to Wyatt, both disciples of Serafino and his associates."

But this clever explanation fails to satisfy. Granted of course that both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais were under the influence of Serafino (Prof. Koepfel⁴ has shown this for Wyatt and M. Vianey⁵ for Saint-Gelais). Yet it seems strange that both normally should turn to Sannazaro that was on the contrary not Quattrocentistic. Why did they not copy one of the one hundred and sixteen sonnets definitely written by him? It was not because they were not accessible, as M. Vaganay lists twenty-five editions before 1550, or in Tibaldeo, Pamfilo Sasso, or any other poet of the Quattrocento? This is the first of the curious chances which Professor Kastner's theory presupposes, that two men independently, because they are influenced by one author of a certain type, copy another author who represents a different type.

To this is added that of the eighty-eight sonnets published under the name of Sannazaro, both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais chose but one, and they chose only this because "its exaggerated metaphors and strained hyperboles single it out from the rest of Sannazaro's sonnets." But Wyatt in the sixteen sonnets which he translated from

Petrarch was not necessarily influenced by exaggerated metaphor.

"The long love that in my heart I harbor,"

for example, to chose the first at hand, is surely not Quattrocentistic. In the case of one man the selection of this sonnet is curious; in the case of two it becomes significant.

Under these circumstances Professor Kastner shows his critical acumen in stressing the peculiarities of this sonnet. It consists in a series of comparisons, the first line particularizing a natural feature and the succeeding line applying it to the conditions of the lover. Yet, even granting with Flamini⁶ that "è chiaro che (Sannazaro) le ha rimaneggiate secondo i nuovi criteri d'arte, poi che son scritto nel più puro idioma letterario, col più corretto petrarchismo e ne' soli metri consacrati dell'esempio del lirico trecentista," other sonnets in the collection may be found not so dissimilar as to force us to the conclusion that that one alone should be imitated. They might have remained "true to at least one side of their natural bent" and imitated the elaborate comparison of sonnet seventeen,⁷

"O vita, vita nò, ma vivo affanno,
Navi di vetro in mar di cieco errore . . ."

or sonnet twenty, wherein the loved one is compared elaborately to a burning-glass, or sonnet forty where with a triumph of conceit Sannazaro has united the double features of the basilisk and the labyrinth. Under these circumstances it is worthy of remark that two men should have happened to choose the same sonnet.

Consequently I do not feel that Professor Kastner is justified in assigning a motive to Sannazaro in composing that one sonnet. The unsubstantiated hypothesis is the curse of scholarship. To the scholar it "almost looks as if," to the popularizer it is a fact, and another error has been added to the list. It must be borne in mind that we know absolutely nothing concerning the origin of the sonnet in question. Professor Kastner is willing to go much farther than the recent editor of

³ *Modern Language Review*, Vol. iv, p. 250.

⁴ Emil Koepfel, *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 67.

⁵ Joseph Vianey, *ibid.*, pp. 50-58.

⁶ Francesco Flamini, *Il Cinquecento*, p. 176-7.

⁷ *Le Opere Volgari di M. Jacopo Sannazaro*, In Padova, 1723.

Cariteo, Sig. Pèrcopo,⁸ who on this point says: "La maggiore e miglior parte delle rime di Sincero era stata composta sotto il regno degli Aragonesi, e il Chariteo ben poteva conoscerle." Sig. Pèrcopo shows clearly that Cariteo imitated Sannazaro, and Sig. Scherillo⁹ shows us that Serafino did also, but that Sannazaro imitated Cariteo or "had one day wished to show his friends that he could, if he so desired, hold his own with them on their own ground," Sig. Pèrcopo¹⁰ opposes with an emphatic negative: "Che il Sannazaro avesse, invece, imitato il Gareth, non pare: egli era troppo altero e disdegnoso." Even in general I can find no grounds for this hypothesis.

But the singularity of this hypothesis is still further increased by a glance at the literary history of this particular sonnet. So far from knowing with what motive Sannazaro composed it, we do not even know that he composed it at all! It was apparently attributed to him only *because it was like his manner*. Of Sannazaro's *Rime* I know fourteen different editions in the sixteenth century. But only four of them, the editions of 1531, 1532, 1533, and 1538, have the Third Part, in which alone this sonnet appears. Moreover as the first three of these four have one other distinguishing characteristic, namely that no place of publication is given, obviously their publication was irregular. In them all the Third Part is separately entitled: "Delle Rime di M. Giacomo Sannazaro Nobile Napoletano, la terza parte nuouamente aggiunta, dal suo proprio originale cauata, con somma diligenza corretta & stampata." This, however, does not seem to have been above suspicion, as the 1538 Venetian editors feel it necessary to prefix the following note: "Ecco Studiosi Letteri, la Terza Parte delle Rime di Missier Giacomo Sannazaro: la quale da alcuni riprouata per delicatezza d'orecchie (per non attribuirlo a mancamento di sapere, ò pure a inuidia della fama di questo Ilustre Poeta) noi, con parere di molti, forse di loro più esperti nell'arte; l'habbiamo qui posta, a commune beneficio de' intendenti di Poesia; essendo cosa irragionevole,

defraudare il mondo di così degno frutto, & il Poeta della gloria di così nobil fatica." Even this critical fulmination seems to have been unconvincing, as the editors of the next edition, 1543, not only omit it but also pride themselves on the omission: "Non so che altri pochi sonetti, capitoli, canzoni, che uanno, Lettori miei candidi, attorno, sotto'l nome dell'autore, noi studiosamente gli habbiamo lasciati, non per schisar fatica, ò defraudarvi del la lor lettione à tempo, come è costume di Barbari, auari stampatori: ma perche ne sono quelli parsi & alle nostre purgate orecchie poco conueneuoli, e de la elegantia, e leggiadria d'un sì giudicioso spirto, come era il nostro Sannazaro del tutto indegni." Their example was followed in all the other editions until 1723, the Crusca edition, in which the terse comment is added, "Come alcuni suppongono." To my knowledge the question has never been settled. So far from our knowing Sannazaro's motive in composing it, the very question of authorship is unsolved. By far the balance of early authority, the weight of Lodovico Dolce, is against it. On the other hand it is sufficiently like his manner to have been included in some of the early editions. Here again, then, we are startled by the coincidence of finding two men imitating a disputed sonnet which appears in but four of the ten editions previous to 1547, the date of the Saint-Gelais volume.

Up to this point the reasoning has been rather negative than positive. Nor is the positive side at all satisfactory. Wyatt normally translates with extreme accuracy, and in this particular instance has done so beyond his usual custom. Saint-Gelais on the other hand has allowed himself so much freedom that if we knew nothing but the text of the sonnets in question, it would be almost hopeless to make a case. Yet, altho in sixteen lines there is not much opportunity for internal criticism, certain similarities in rendering deserve notice. First, whereas the ryming sounds in the Italian octave are *monti-doglie-voglie-fonti*, Wyatt has *montayns-ire-desire-fontayns* and Gaint-Gelais *lointaine-deplaisir-désir-certaine*. The third lines respectively read

⁸ *Le Rime di Benedetto Gareth*, Erasmo Pèrcopo, Napoli 1892, I, xcviil.

⁹ *Arcadia di Jacobo Sannazaro*, Michele Scherillo, ccix, note.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xcviil.

Alti son questi, ed alti le mie voglie
for of great height be they, & high is my desire
Haut est leur chef, et haut est mon désir.

Here the last half of the French line is a literal translation of the English; both poets agree in rendering the Italian plural in the singular. The tenth line reads

Soffian sempre fra lor rabbiosi venti

where the *lor* refers to the mountains. Wyatt is more specific:

The boysteous wyndes oft their high bowghes do blast.

The *their* normally refers again to mountains. In Saint-Gelais,

Et de grands vents leur cime est toute pleine,

the *cime* may of course refer to mountains. As in this case, however, he describes a distant mountain top as being full of wind, it seems more likely that he had Wyatt's line in mind, that the top referred to is a tree top which would naturally be full of wind. Again whereas the Sannazaro ends normally (cdeded) Saint-Gelais follows the English fashion in ending with a couplet. Altho these similarities are apparently trivial, the fact is important, that whereas there is nothing common to the Italian and to the French not in the English, there are similarities common to French and English not in the Italian.¹¹ Thus while there is no possible way of proving by internal evidence that Saint-Gelais copied from Wyatt,—it is perfectly possible that he independently chanced upon the same rendition—yet it adds another to the series of coincidences which strains Professor Kastner's theory to the breaking point.

As thus comically enough Professor Kastner and myself are in complete agreement on the main issues, the whole contention may be summarized in a few words:

1. Altho we both accept Sannazaro's sonnet as the original, we know nothing of the datation of any of the three sonnets.

2. Both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais had been in Italy and both were influenced by at least one Italian author beside Petrarch, Serafino.

3. French ignorance of English literature is proverbial and we have no data to show that Saint-Gelais was an exception.

On the other hand:

1. It is curious that the only sonnet in Wyatt taken from another author than Petrarch and the only sonnet of Saint-Gelais published in his first volume should have been chosen from Sannazaro;

2. That they should have both chanced upon the same sonnet;

3. That that sonnet should have been one accessible only in four of ten possible editions;

4. That in every doubtful case they should choose the same renditions;

5. That Saint-Gelais diverges from the Italian and the French in the use of the terminal couplet;

6. That whereas both poets show the influence of Serafino, neither translates a sonnet from him;

7. That Petrarchismo in the sonnet form reached England before it reached France;

8. That as Wyatt was sent as ambassador to the French Court where Saint-Gelais was the court poet, translation from the English to the French is not improbable.

In this case positive proof is impossible. It is merely a question which hypothesis one prefers. Professor Kastner insists that to assume that a single Frenchman knew the English language, or knew a friend who knew the English language, or knew Wyatt who presumably knew French, is audacious and startling. But is it any more startling than to assume that two men working independently chanced upon the same author, chanced upon one sonnet only, chanced upon the same sonnet, chanced upon a sonnet which appears in a minority of editions, and chanced to make the same renderings? Personally—with apologies to Professor Kastner—my position seems the more probable. If this be accepted, it is but again the story of the exception to the rule and should serve as a warning against hasty generalization.

JOHN M. BERDAN.

New Haven, Conn.

¹¹This statement does not hold of the version of the Wyatt sonnet published in *Tottel*. The text as given by Wyatt's autograph manuscript is in Professor Padelford's *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics*, D. C. Heath, Boston, 1907.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE ZUR TECHNIK DES
NEUEREN DEUTSCHEN ROMANS. II.

- E. ZOLA. Die auf den Roman angewandte kritische Formel. (Übersetzung von Berg.) *M. L.*, 60. 819-21. (Taines Methode der Kritik ist die Methode des naturalistischen Romans.)
- SOSNOSKY. *Ridicula*. Breslau, Trewent, 1893. 103 SS.
- GEORG v. OMPTEDA. Gedanken eines Romanschriftstellers über seine Kunst. *Velh. u. Klas. Mts.-Hfte.*, XVIII, 4, 1903-4.
- R. M. MEYER. Auerbachs Bauern. *Die Dichtung*, 29. S. 62-4.
- , Die Kunstform des Romans. *Zeit* (Berlin), 2¹. S. 730-1.
- PAZSONY. Der Roman Rich. Wagners. *Lpz.*, 1903.
- J. MINOR. Tieck als Novellendichter. *Akademische Blätter*, 1884.
- M. WUNDTKE. Die Entwicklung der erzähl. Litt. *Gegw.*, 62, No. 34.
- , Wie soll erzählt werden? *Pr. Jbb.*, 92. SS. 53-66.
- ESSWEIN. Moderne Prosaunst. *Freistatt*, 4. S. 205-8.
- STROTMANN. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kampfs um Rom. Nach Mitteilungen von F. Dahn. *Jgdspeigel*, Sept., 1901.
- COENEN. Novelle u. Drama. *Grot Nederland*, Febr., 1903.
- WUNDTKE. Entartung der erzählenden Litteratur. *Gegenwart*, 26, No. 31.
- , Eine Frage an den Litteraturtechniker. *Grenzboten*, 2. S. 299-300.
- , Eine Romanfrage. *K. V. Ztg.*, No. 981 (betrifft Feuilletonromane).
- ARMINIUS. Der Wartburgroman. *Gegenwart*, 64. S. 387-89. (Die Wartburg im Epos.)
- JNGST. Vom deutschen Feuilleton. (Dazu P. Zchorlicht. *Hilfe*, No. 49). *Hilfe*, 9, N. 47.
- , Hilligenlei. Probleme u. Technik (in Mitteilungen der litt.-hist. Gesellschaft). *Bonn*, 1, 30.
- F. C. HEER. Wie mein erster Roman entstand. *L. E.*, 3. S. 1317-23.
- PORITZKY. Der Wert der Anekdote. (Behandelt Dostojewsky; S. Smiles; Lamettrie.) *Voss. Ztg.*, B. No. 4.
- ENGEL. Wandlungen des Romans. *Nat. Ztg.*, 1902, No. 521.
- LAMPRECHT. Der Roman als Ankläger der Gesellschaft. u. s. w. *Dichterstimmen der Gegenwart*, 17, No. 7.
- BERTRANG. Zur deutsch. katholischen Romanlitt. der Neuzeit. *Jb. d. d. Vereins z. Hebung der Muttersprache in Belgien*. Arem-Willems.
- W. RATH. Zola, der Naturalismus u. wir. *Deutschland*, 1. SS. 3567-4.
- KRETZER. Wie ich schaffe. *Berlin. Ill. Zg.*, No. 14.
- WALZEL. Historische Romane deutscher Romantiker. Untersuchungen über den Einfluss W. Scotts. Bern, A. Franke. [Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- u. Lit.-Gesch. von O. Walzel, 7. Heft.]
- P. HEYSE. Aus der Werkstatt. *W. I. D. M.* 88. S. 661-72.
- SPIELHAGEN. Gestalten des Dichters. *D. Rs.*, 103. S. 52-61.
- SOSNOSKY. Unwahrheit der Romantchnik. *Gegenwart*, 1907. No. 17-18.
- , Roman u. Novelle. *Türmer*, Febr., 1907. 725-27.
- SCHULTZ v. BRUHL. Der Sonderling. Aus der Werkstatt eines Romandichters. *M. L.*, 65. 962-71. (Gibt aus O. Müllers Briefen Aufschluss über das Schaffen dieses Romandichters.)
- J. SCHJELDERUP. Roman, Drama u. Musikdrama. *N. & S.*, 70; 80-82.
- G. v. OMPTEDA. Vom Schreibtisch u. aus d. Atelier. Wie entsteht ein Roman? *Vel. Klas. Mts.*, 2. S. 57-64.
- KRONENBERG. Ethische Probleme u. dichterische Stimmungen. *Eth. Kultur*, 7. 1899. S. 29-31.
- SPITTELER. Zur ästhetischen Unredlichkeit. *Kw.*, 12². S. 196.
- J. HOWEMANN. Das Wunderbare in E. Th. Am. Hoffmanns Dichtungen. *Deutsche Heimat*, 6. Jahrgang. Heft. 3. 1902-3.
- , Zur Technik des Romans. *Obere Zehntausend*. 1902. No. 24.
- , Roman u. Politik. (Über d. neueren Roman.) *N. W. F. Bl.*, No. 101.
- ENGEL. Erzählungskunst. (Über das Spannende.) *Nat. Ztg.*, No. 209. [S. auch *L. E.* 5. S. 1040-1.]
- H. HART. Vom Kulturwert des Romans. *Tag*, 215. (1906.)
- GOETZ. Die Kunstform des Romans. (Berlin.) *Zeit*, 2¹. 730-1.
- J. WASSERMANN. Die Kunst der Erzählung. *N. D. Rs.*, 1902. 1. S. 82-5.
- v. SOSNOSKY. Wie man Romane schreibt. *Gegenwart*, 59. S. 345-8.
- P. BORORYKIN. Die Untersuchungsmethode des Romans. Deutsche Übersetzung v. L. Kelchner. *M. L.*, 66. S. 553-61. 580-86.
- W. H. RIEHL als Novellist. *Voss. Ztg. B.*, No. 17.
- RIEHL als Novellist. *ZfdU.*, 1896.
- RIEHL d. Poet d. deutschen Novelle. *Zeitfragen d. Christl. Volkslebens*, Heft 159.
- R. M. MEYER. Die Technik der Goncourts. *A. S. N. S.* 29. S. 395-416.
- R. NAGEL. Die Technik des deutschen Romantitels. 1905. D. litt. Deutsch-Österreich, Wien, Juli, 1905. 12-20.
- B. SEUFFERT. Goethes Novelle. *G. Jb.* 19. S. 133-66.
- BENSELER. Noch einmal Eichendorffs Novelle, Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts. (Verteidigung). *Z. D. U.* 13. SS. 263-7. (Technik siehe a. u. Ich-Roman.)
- R. FÜRST. Die Mode im Buchtitel. *L. E.*, III, 16. 1900-1.
- DR. H. MEISNER. Büchertitelmoden. *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, 1904-5, VIII, pp. 38-43.

- R. M. WERNER. Tod u. Sterben in der modernen epischen Dichtung. *Msschrift N. L. K.* 1. SS. 355-64.
- FAURE-FAVIER. La toilette de la femme dans le roman contemporain. *RPL.*, 17. S. 284-8.
- BARTELS, A. Von der Treue im Roman. *Kw.*, 12. SS. 657-60. 1904.
- C. V. LEIXNER. Unschöne Litt. *Tygb. Rs. B.* No. 172-3.
- E. KUNKEL. D. Übermensch im erotischen Roman. *Zeitgeist*, 17.
- KAHLE. Die Unsittlichkeit im Roman. *Gegenwart*, 64. S. 278-9.
- KAHLE. D. Unsittlichkeit im Roman. *Gegenwart*, No. 44. 1903.
- KRONENBERG. Politische Utopien. *Voss. Ztg. B.* 1893. No. 14-5.
- GAGLIARDI. Verbrechen u. Wahnsinn im Drama u. im Roman. *Türmer*, 2. SS. 74-8.
- E. FERRI. Das Verbrechen im Kriminalroman u. im Sensationsdrama. *Wage*, 2. 815-17.
- LOMBROSO, C. Il delinquente ed il pazzo nel drama a nel romanzo moderno. *N. Ant.*, 163. SS. 665-81.
- E. FERRI. Das Verbrechen im mod. Roman. (Übersetz.) *NZ. St.* 18^a. S. 444-8; 477-80; 508-12; 542-4.
- SPIELHAGEN. Die epische Dichtung unterm Zeichen des Verkehrs. *Zukunft*, 17. SS. 153-74.
- KINZEL. Die Weltanschauung im Roman. *Glauben u. Wissen*, 1904, 19-26.
- L. JOSEPH. Verhältnis des Romans zur Wirklichkeit. *Wahrheit*, 7, No. 8.
- SCHÖNTHAN. Der Zeitungsroman. *Zukunft*, 42. S. 512-13.
- , Zeitungsromane. *Kölnische Ztg.*, 12-4. 1903.
- SCHUMANN. Romane in Zeitungen. *Kw.*, 13¹. S. 296-301.
- VON GROTHUSS. Der Zukunftsstaat im Spiegel des mod. Romans. *Us.*, II, 498-512.
- , Der Roman der Zukunft. *Kw.*, 5. 52.
- BERG. Der Zukunftsroman. *L. E.*, 2. S. 159-65.
- , Die Zukunft des deutsch. Romans. *Jbb. Ak. Erfurt*, 23. S. 106.
- , Zwei-Männer-Romane. *Heimat*, 3. B., 135. 1900.
- BÜCHER UND BROSCHÜREN.¹
- BALDENSPERGER. G. Keller, sa vie et ses œuvres. *Paris*, Hachette. 1899.
- BARBEY D'AUREVILLY. Le roman contemporain. *Paris*, 1902.
- A. BARTELS. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. (Band II. Das 19. Jahrhundert. S. 376-813. Über d. Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts.) Avenarius, 1902.
- L. BERG. Neue Essays. *Oldenburg*, 1901. (Darin Essays über den Dichter und sein Modell. Der Zukunftsroman.)
- BLANKENBURG. Versuch über den Roman, 1766, (Erste Technik des Romans.)
- C. A. BLOEDAN. Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus und seine Vorgänger. Beiträge zur Romanteknik des 17. Jahrhunderts. 1906. *Berlin*, Mayer u. Müller.
- F. BOBERTAG. Geschichte des Romans. I. Band. *Breslau*, 1876. (Band I, bis Anfang des 18. Jahrhunderts.)
- W. BÖLSCHKE. Hinter der Weltstadt. Diederichs, 1901, —, Die naturwissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Poesie, Prolegomena einer realistischen Ästhetik. *Leipzig*, 1887.
- P. BORNSTEIN. Die Dichter des Todes in der modernen Literatur. 40 SS. *Leipzig*, 1900.
- , Der Tod in der Literatur u. andere Essays. Cotta, 1900.
- H. H. BOYESSEN. Essays on German Literature. (Darin: The Germ. Novel.) *London u. New York*.
- BRASCH. Soziale Phantasiestaaten. *Leipzig*, Huth, 1885.
- BRUNETIÈRE. Le roman naturaliste. (nouvelle ed.) Calman-Levy, *Paris*, 1896.
- H. S. CANBY. The Short Story. Holt, *New York*, 1902.
- A. CHASSANG. Histoire du roman et de ses rapports avec l'histoire dans l'antiquité grecque et latine. 2e. éd. *Paris*, 1862.
- CAZAMIAN. Le roman social en Angleterre 1830-50. *Thiers*, 1904.
- CHOLEVIUS. Die bedeutendsten Romane des 17. Jahrh. Teubner, *Leipzig*, 1866.
- W. L. CROSS. The Development of the English Novel. *New York*, 1899.
- DIEDRICH, DR. BENNO. Von Gespenstergeschichten, ihrer Technik u. ihrer Literatur. SS. 266-319. *Leipzig*, 1903.
- DONNER. Der Einfluss Wilh. Meisters auf den Roman der Romantiker. (Diss. Helsingfors) 211 SS. R. Heinrich, *Berlin*, 1893.
- DU MOULIN ECKART. Der historische Roman in Deutschland und seine Entwicklung. Verlag Deutsche Stimmen, *Berlin*, 1905.
- DUNLAP. History of Prose Fiction. *London*, 1814. Revised Ed., *London*, 1888.
- F. W. EBELING. Der deutsche Roman. Ein Menetekel, 103 SS. Trautvetter, *Berlin*, 1891.
- J. v. EICHENDORF. Der deutsche Roman des 18. Jahrh. in seinem Verhältnis zum Christentum. Brockhaus, *Leipzig*, 1851.
- FEIERFEIL. Zur Technik der modernen Erzählung. Programm des Obergymnasiums Landskron, 1894. 29 SS. [Ergänzung zur Poetik W. Scherer's; aus dessen Rezensionen zusammengetragen.]
- FREYTAG. Vermischte Aufsätze aus den Jahren 1848-94. Herausgegeben v. Elster. *Leipzig*, 1901.
- J. FRIEDMANN. Verbrechen u. Krankheit im Roman und auf der Bühne. Paul Wessenthal, *Berlin*, 1889.
- R. FÜRST. Die Vorläufer der modernen Novelle im 18. Jahrh. Niemeyer, *Halle*, 1897.
- , Deutschlands Roman im 19. Jahrh. Calve, *Prag*. SS. 16.
- K. GAEBEL. Beitrag zur Technik der Erzählung in den Romanen von Walter Scott. Elwert, *Marburg*, 1901.

¹ Für Allgemeines zur älteren Zeit, sowie über amerikanische, französische und englische Werke siehe Whitcomb, *The Study of a Novel*, Heath & Co., 1905.

- GARNIER. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Novellendichtung. L. Tücks, *Giessen*, 1899.
- H. GERSCHMANN. Studien über den modernen Roman. Programm des Realgymnasiums Königsberg i. Preussen, 1894. W. Koch, *Königsberg*, 1894.
- E. GILBERT. Le roman en France pendant le 19^e siècle. 2^e édition, *Paris*, 1896.
- G. v. GLASENAPP. Eine moderne Novelle u. ein unmö-derner Novellist. Essay. SS. 107-23. *Riga*, Ponck und Polienesky.
- GOETHE. Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre, v, 7. (Beziehungen zwischen Drama u. Roman.)
- R. v. GOTTSCHALL. Studien zur neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte. (Darin: Auf dem Gebiet des Romans.) *Berlin*, 1892.
- , Die deutsche Nationallitteratur des 19. Jahrh. 7. Auflage. (4 Bände.) Trewendt, *Breslau*. 30 mk.
- GRÄF. Goethe über seine Dichtungen. Versuch einer Sammlung aller Äusserungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke. 1 Th. Die epischen Dichtungen. 2 Bde. 1902, *Frankfurt a/M.*
- GREGOROVIVS. Die Verwendung historischer Stoffe in der erzählenden Literatur. *München*, 1891.
- HAKEN. Bibliothek der Robinsone. 5 Bde. *Berlin*, 1905-8.
- LILLI HALLER. Jeremias Gotthelf. Studien zur Erzählungstechnik. *Bern*, 1906.
- HARNACK. Über die Verwendbarkeit historischer Stoffe in der Dichtung. (17. SS.) *Darmstadt*, 1901.
- R. HAYM. Die Romantische Schule. *Berlin*, 1870.
- R. HEINE. Der Roman in Deutschland von 1774-78, Niemeyer, 1892, *Halle*.
- HETTNER. Robinson u. Robinsonaden. Hertz, *Berlin*, 1854.
- P. HEYSE. Jugenderinnerungen u. Bekenntnisse. Hertz, *Berlin*, 1900.
- P. D. HUET. Essai sur l'origine des romans. 6^e éd. *Paris*, 1865.
- G. JAKOB. Die Pseudogenies bei A. Daudet. Eine literar. psychologische Untersuchung zur inneren Entwicklung des französischen Realismus. 99 P. 8°. *Borna-Leipzig*, 1906, Noske.
- KAYSERLING. Die jüdische Litteratur von Moses Mendelssohn bis auf die Gegenwart. (Sonderabdruck aus Winter und A. Wünsche. "Die jüd. Litt. seit Abschluss des Kanons." Bd. III.) Sigmund Mayer, 1896.
- G. KEBEN. Die Prostitution und ihre Beziehungen zur modernen realistischen Litteratur. Verlags-Magazin, *Zürich*, 1892.
- KEITER. Katholische Erzähler der neuesten Zeit. Litt.-hist. Studien. 396 SS. *Paderborn*, 1890.
- , Theorie des Romans und der Erzählungskunst. Vermehrte u. verbesserte Auflage v. T. Keller. *Essen-Ruhr*, 1904.
- KLEINWÄCHTER. Die Staatsromane. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Communismus u. Socialismus. *Wien*, 1891.
- F. KLINCKESIECK. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Realismus im französischen Roman des 19. Jahrh. *Marsburg*, 1891.
- KLIPPENBERG. Robinson in Deutschland bis zur Insel Felsenburg. *Hannover*, 1892.
- KLOSS. M. Kretzer. Eine Studie zur neueren Litteratur 1896, *Dresden*.
- TH. KOCH. Die Schundlitteratur. Ihre Verderblichkeit u. ihre Bekämpfung. 32 SS. L. Wallmann, 1900.
- KOHLSCHEIDT. Der evangelische Pfarrer in der modernen Dichtung. Schwetschke, 1901.
- KREYSSIG. Vorlesungen über den deutschen Roman der Gegenwart. Nicolaische Buchhandlung. *Berlin*, 1870.
- KRONENBERG. Schlaraffia politica. Geschichte der Dichtungen vom besten Staat. 318 SS. L. Grunow, 1892, *Leipzig*.
- LEYH. Studie zur Technik der Novelle bei G. Keller. (Berücksichtigt bes. Ästhetisches.) Diss. *Tübingen*.
- B. LITZMANN. Zur Entwicklung des modernen Romans. *Frankfurt a/M.*, 1895. (Auch *D. R.* 2. S. 293-308.)
- O. LUDWIG. Epische Studien. Wke. Band 6. (Hesse.)
- J. MÄHLY. Der Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Berlin*, 1872.
- MAIGRON. Le roman historique à l'époque romantique. *Paris*, 1898.
- MAUERHOF. C. F. Meyer oder die Kunstform des Romans. *Zürich*, Henckell, 1897.
- MEYER-BENEFY. Die moderne Litteratur und die Sittlichkeit. *Leipzig*, 1903.
- H. MIELKE. Geschichte des Romans. Sammlung Göschens, *Leipzig*, 1904.
- MIELKE. Der deutsche Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Berlin*, 1898.
- R. v. MOHL. Die Geschichte u. Litteratur der Staatswissenschaften. (Im III. Bd. Die Staatsromane.) Enke, *Erlangen*, 1856.
- MORILLOT. Le roman en France depuis 1610 jusqu'à nos jours. *Paris*, Masson, O. J.
- MORSIER. Romanciers allemands contemporains. Perrin et Cie, *Paris*, 1890.
- MÜLLER-FRAUREUTH. Die Ritter- und Räuberromane. (Beitrag zur Bildungsgeschichte des deutschen Volkes.) *Halle a/S.*, 1894.
- MÜLLER-EMS. O. Ludwigs Erzählungskunst. *Berlin*, 1905.
- NICOLAI. Entstehung u. Wesen des griechischen Romans. 1867. Calvary & Comp., *Berlin*.
- NOWACK. Liebe u. Ehe im deutschen Roman zu Rousseaus Zeiten. 1747-70. Franke, 1906, *Bern*.
- B. PERRY. A Study of Prose Fiction. *Boston*, 1902.
- L. PINEAU. L'évolution du roman en Allemagne au 19^e siècle. 328 SS. *Paris*, Hachette, 1909.
- R. REHORN. Der deutsche Roman. *Leipzig*, 1890.
- R. RICHTER. Die Entwicklungsgeschichte des Seeromans in England im 19. Jahrh. 83 SS. Meinhold u. Söhne, *Leipzig*. Diss., 1906.
- RIEMANN. Goethes Romantchnik. Seemanns Nachf., 1901.
- ROBIATE. Il Romanzo Contemporaneo in Italia. *Milano*, 1892.

- ROESSEL. Die litt. u. persönlichen Beziehungen W. Scotts zu Goethe. Diss. *Leipzig*, 1901. (Ein Beitrag zum Studium über das Verhältnis der deutschen Litt. zur englischen am Ende des 18. Jahrh. u. Anfang d. 19. Jahrh.)
- SCHERER. Die Anfänge des deutschen Prosaromans. *Strassburg*, 1877.
- DR. SCHIAN. Der Roman seit Goethe. *Görlitz*, 1904.
- E. SCHMIDT. Der moderne Roman. *Osnabrück*, 1907.
- , Charakteristiken. 2. Reihe. *Berlin*, Weidmann.
- , Richardson, Rousseau und Goethe. Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romans im 18. Jahrhundert. *Jena*, 1875.
- C. SCHMITT. Der moderne Roman. *Osnabrück*, Pilmeyer.
- SCHULTHEISS. Der Schelmenroman der Spanier und seine Nachbildungen. *Hamburg*, 1893.
- F. SPIELHAGEN. Neue Beiträge zur Theorie u. Technik der Epik u. Dramatik. Staackmann, 1893.
- , Beiträge zur Theorie u. Technik der Epik u. Dramatik. 1898.
- , Beiträge z. Theorie u. Technik des Romans. *Leipzig*, 1883.
- , Die Epische Poesie und Goethe. *Goethe Jb.*, 1895.
- H. STICKELBERGER. Die Kunstmittel in C. F. Meyers Novellen. 72 SS. Langlois & Comp., *Burgdorf*.
- R. STODDARD. The Evolution of the English Novel. *New York*, 1900.
- L. TIECK. Zur Geschichte der Novelle. 375 SS. Krit. Schriften Bd. II.
- ULRICH. G. Freytags Romantchnik. *Strassburg*, 1908.
- ULLRICH. Robinson und Robinsonaden. Teil I. Bibliographie, 1898, *Weimar*.
- M. v. WALDBERG. Der empfindsame Roman in Frankreich. Teil I. *Strassburg*, 1906.
- J. WASSERMANN. Die Kunst in der Erzählung. (In 'Die Litteratur' herausgegeben von G. Brandes. Bd. 8.) Bard, Marquardt & Comp. M. 1,75. *Berlin*, 1904.
- M. WIDMANN. Albr. v. Hallers Staatsromane. *Bielefeld*, 1894.
- O. L. B. WOLFF. Allgemeine Geschichte des Romans, von dessen Ursprung bis zur neuesten Zeit. *Jena*, 1841.
- WYSEWAS. Le roman contemporain à l'étranger. Perrin, *Paris*, 1900.
- N. WENGER. Historische Romane deutscher Romantiker. Untersuchungen über den Einfluss W. Scotts. A. Franke, *Bern*, 1905.
- ZEITLER. Typen des Essays in "Taten u. Worte." SS. 263. Seemann, *Leipzig*.
- VON ZEIDLER. Zur Novellistik K. F. Meyers. 30 SS. Programm, Waidhofen a. d. Thaya.
- E. ZOLA. Le roman naturaliste. *Paris*. Autorisierte Übersetzung v. L. Berg. Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1893.
- ZOLA. Le roman experimental. Charpentier, *Paris*, 1880.
- , Les romanciers naturalistes. *Paris*, 1890.

CHARLES HART HANDSCHIN.

Miami University.
Jan., 1909.

A NOTE ON THE TEMPEST.

The Shakespeare editors and glossarists are still in doubt as to the meaning of the words 'pioned' and 'twilled' in the following passage from *The Tempest* (IV, 1. 60-67):

"Ceres, most bounteous lady, thy rich leas,
Of wheat, rye, barley, fetches, oats, and pease;
Thy turfy mountains, where live nibbling sheep,
And flat meads thatch'd with stover, them to keep;
Thy banks with pioned and twilled brims,
Which spongy April at thy best betrimms,
To make cold nymphs chaste crowns—"

The easy way out of the difficulty, assuming "error of the press," has, as usual, been tried. "Throw out the 'w' of 'twilled' and we have 'tilled.'" 'Tulip'd,' 'lilied,' 'willowed,' are other suggested emendations. Dr. Furness, after devoting nearly six pages (pp. 195-201), of the Variorum to proposed explanations, says: "I doubt if there be any corruption in this line which calls for change. We have simply lost the meanings of words which were perfectly intelligible to Shakespeare's audience." The most recent editors, as those of the Arden and the Temple editions, either satisfy themselves with quoting the earlier editors, or, as Dyce (*Glossary*, revised by Little-dale), discreetly omit.

A digest of the explanations offered places them in two groups. The first group includes those explanations that interpret 'pioned' and 'twilled' as covered with flowers: 'pioned' equivalent to "overgrown with peonies," that is, the marsh-marigold, and 'twilled' as 'grown up in reeds.' Provincial words are cited in support of these meanings. The second group contains those explanations that would interpret 'pioned' as 'dug' or 'trenched,' and 'twilled' as 'ridged,' and fit these interpretations into the passage in various ways.

The explanations of the first group are now virtually abandoned. The *NED.* says of 'pioned': "The meaning of 'pioned' in the Shaks. passage has been much disputed. . . . (The conjecture overgrown with marsh-marigolds . . . is not supported by any sense of *peony* known to Britten and Holland, *Eng. Plant Names*, or to *Eng. Dial. Dict.*)." Skeat under 'twill' says: "'Twilled in *The Tempest* is yet unexplained."

Henley (not "W. E.") seems first to have suggested the explanations of the second group. Although accepted by Dr. Furness and others temporarily as "the best means of enabling 'spongy April' to betrim the banks," Henley's explanation seems to have convinced no one. It can be shown, I think, that Henley is probably in error with regard to all three words: 'banks,' 'pioned,' and 'twilled.'

Henley, as quoted in full by Dr. Furness, contends that the passage does not warrant the assumption that the banks are those of a river; that since these banks are in the care of Ceres, they must be mounds or banks out in the meadow, thus more definitely within Ceres's province. "The giving way of the brims of those banks, occasioned by the heats, rains, and frosts of the preceding year are made good by opening ['pioning'] the trenches from whence [*sic*] the banks themselves were first raised, and ['twilling'] them, that is] facing them up with the mire those trenches contain. . . . 'Twilled' is obviously from the French *touiller*, which Cotgrave interprets "filthily to mix or mingle; confound or shuffle together; bedurt [*sic*]; begrime; besmear,"—significations that confirm the explanation here given." This last a fine *circulus in probando*!

'Pion' means, according to the *NED.*, "to dig, trench, excavate." The English word is from the Old French *pioner*, which is derived from *pion*, a foot soldier, originally from the Latin, *pes*. Related English words are 'peon,' 'pawn,' 'pioneer,' the last meaning originally a foot soldier. Shakespeare's form of 'pioneer' is 'pioner,' as in *Hamlet*, I, 5. 163, *Henry V*, III, 2. 92, *Othello*, III, 3. 346, and *Lucrece*, 1380. The pioneers were the company of soldiers on foot, who, with axes, picks, and shovels, preceded the cavalry to clear the way, and whose special office it was also to undermine fortified places and to throw up breastworks. To 'pion,' then, is to do the work of a pioneer. The idea of throwing up an embankment as a means of defense or protection is the only meaning possible in Spenser's passage (*F. Q.*, II, x. 63-64):

"Which to outbarre, with painful pionings
From sea to sea he heaped a mighty mound."

This meaning of 'pion' (p. p. 'pioned'), 'to throw up an embankment for protection,' seems never to have been suggested; yet it is abundantly warranted.

This is the sense in which I propose to take 'pioned' in the passage under discussion.

'Twill' is used by Shakespeare only in this place. The word in its legitimate English meaning is "to weave so as to produce diagonal lines or ribs on the surface of the cloth." The shuttle passes over one and under two threads of the woof; hence Dutch *twillen*, from the root of 'two.' Where an embankment is to be subjected to the action of water it is frequently constructed of alternate layers of branches of trees and earth. In this way the embankment is re-enforced. The branches thus placed would produce upon the 'brim'—the top and sides of the embankment—the 'twilled' effect. In this figurative use I would interpret 'twilled' in *The Tempest*.

Finally, since "flat meads" usually lie along the banks of streams, and since these banks with brims so perfectly conform with those on the sides of a stream which have been thrown up, as dykes, to protect the "flat meads" from overflow, is it a violent assumption to suppose there is a stream in this case? Surely these banks, constructed to protect her "stover" from damage by flood, would be peculiarly under the care of Ceres. This assumption becomes indeed only natural inference when supported by the unforced interpretation of the other difficult words of the passage.

Problems of the nature of this one are impossible of a Q. E. D.; we must select that explanation which best meets the conditions. According to my suggestion, we have banks of a stream—otherwise 'pioned' would have lost its special significance—with brims 'pioned'—artificially heaped up for protection—and 'twilled'—criss-crossed with branches of trees. These banks "spongy April" would have no difficulty in betrimming with flowers "to make cold nymphs chaste crowns." Shakespeare may easily have had in mind the Avon with its low-lying, flat meads protected by such embankments.

Is it too much to hope that the following prophecy of Dr. Furness has been fulfilled?—"As agricultural or horticultural forms 'pioned' and 'twilled' will be some day, probably, sufficiently explained to enable us to weave from them the chaste crowns for cold nymphs."

THOMAS PERRIN HARRISON.

A. and M. College, West Raleigh, North Carolina.

A CONFESSION OF SINS, AND A
PRAYER TO CHRIST.

In Herrig's *Archiv*, volume 98 (1897), Dr. Furnivall printed a poem which he called "A Confession of Sins, and a Prayer to Christ." Later he printed the same poem in volume 117, (p. 785) of the *Publications of the Early English Text Society*. The piece, which was found in the binding of a book, was so torn that Dr. Furnivall tried, but not with entire success, to supply the missing parts. A variant of this poem is found in volume 98 (p. 19) of the *Publications of the E. E. T. S.* By comparing the two versions we shall be able to get a more correct text. The poem in volume 98 we shall call Version A, and the mutilated poem in volume 117 Version B.

Version A begins :

Swete Ihesu crist, to þe,
A gulti wrecche Ich gelde me
for sunnes þat ichaue ido
In al my lyf hider-to.

Version B begins :

Swete ihesu crist, to þe,
Copable wrecche ich gelde me,
Of sennes þat ich habbe ydo
Yn al my lyue hider-to.

Version B follows Version A, with slight variations to l. 9, when four lines, which in A deal with the Commandments, in B are entirely missing. Line 9 of B corresponds to l. 13 of A; and B now follows A closely, except that B has an extra line after l. 12, and after 20 of B there are four lines in A which in B are lacking. Dr. Furnivall's restorations may be corrected as follows :

L. 18. And of al my [grete] folye
should be simply

And of al my folye.

Cf. Version A :

"And of alle my folye."

Dr. Furnivall prints l. 22 as follows :

"Efter my senful dede, . . ."

with the note : "Two lines are no doubt left out after l. 22; the sense wants, 'If thou rewardest me according to my sinful deeds I must go to hell,' or some equivalent words to make a couplet."

By comparing B with A we see that no lines have been omitted.

Version A reads :

Ne gif þou me none mede
Aftur my sunful dede.
But aftur, lord, þi grete pite
Ihesu lord, asoyle þou me.

Version B reads :

gef þou me none med[e]
Efter my senful dede [. . .]
Ak after, lord, þy grete [pite]
Lord ihesu, asoyle þou me.

Lines 30-31 Dr. Furnivall restores thus :

"And let me neuere b[e so nice]
To do no maner dede [of vice]."

Version A reads :

And let me neuere eft beginne
To do no more dedly synne.

Lines 36-37 of B reads :

Yn-to at blisse of [hevenriche]
þen þou regnest lo[rd . . .]

The A text has it :

In to þat blisful Empyre
þer þat þou regnest lord and sire.

The doubtful portion of B as restored by comparison with A is printed below :

Line 17. And of al my folye,
Mercy, lord, mercy, ich crye !
Al-þag ich sengede euere,
Lord, ich for-soc þe neuere.
gef þou me none med[e]
Efter my senful dede,
Ak efter, lord þy grete [pite],
Lord ihesu, asoyle þou me,
And send me ofte, er y [deye]
Sorge of herte and teres o[f ege]
For sennes þat ich habbe [ido]
Yn al my lyue hider [to] ;
And let me neuere [eft] b[eginne]
To do no maner dede[ly synne]
So þat ich at myn end[ynge-day]
Clene of sennede [may],
Srifte and housele at [myn ende],
þat my saule mote [wende]
Yn-to þat blisse of [Empyre]
þer þou regnest, lo[rd and sire].

In l. 29 I have inserted "eft" from the corresponding line of Version A. Line 33, in Ver-

sion *A* reads: "blisful Empyre" instead of "blisse of" of *B*. I have preferred to insert "Empyre" from the *A* text and to change the *n* of *pen* in the next line to *r* without further emendation, even though the reading is not entirely satisfactory.

FRANK A. PATTERSON.

Columbia University.

THE DATE OF THE SCENE OF TIECK'S STERNBALD.

Minor, in his edition of Tieck's *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen* (Kürschner, D. N. L., vol. 145) attempts to set the date when the scene of the novel is supposed to have taken place. The entire internal evidence of the work taken as a whole, does not bear out Minor's contention.

In the story (page 264) Franz asks the unknown monk, "Was macht der edle Rafael von Urbino? Habt Ihr ihn noch gesehen?" The monk answers, "Nein, leider hat diese Zier der edlen Malerkunst die Erde verlassen; er ist im vorigen Jahre gestorben." Minor's note to this reads, "Raphael ist 1520 gestorben. Tieck hält also auch hier den Zeitpunkt der Handlung fest, auf welchen das Gespräch zwischen Dürer und Lukas verweist: 1521."

The visit of Dürer to Lukas von Leyden, which is historical, took place in 1521, according to a note in Dürer's diary. Tieck's version of this visit is given in the course of the story, but as can be seen from a careful perusal of the novel, it is made to occur in the year before Franz' conversation with the monk. That is, Franz leaves Leyden, passes the winter in part with Vansen in Antwerp and with the beginning of the second volume, enters upon a new spring. According to this, Franz would be questioning the monk in the year 1522 which does not agree with the statement in regard to Rafael's death. It is plain that Tieck has blurred the outlines of his chronology, a discrepancy which Minor has evidently not noticed.

Now in the course of the conversation during the visit (*op. cit.* 192), Lukas is made to say that he is not yet 30 years old, indeed scarcely 29. This offers a new difficulty, for Lukas was born in 1494 and his twenty-ninth year would fall in

1523. By this reckoning Franz would be questioning the monk in 1524.

This, however, is not all, for a curious error on Tieck's part adds a final complication. Franz (page 267) asks Rafael's age at death and is told that he lived to be 39. This is quite wrong, as Tieck surely knew very well. In the Tieck-Wackenroder *Herzensergiessungen* (Jessen's ed., page 129) the age is correctly given as 37. The question now arises, was Tieck dating from a wrong birth date, from a wrong death date or was the whole an unconscious slip? If the latter, then the error persists into the *Schriften*, where in volume XVI it is still uncorrected.

While it is hardly conceivable that Tieck would deliberately add two years to Rafael's age in order to reconcile the hazy chronology of the story, yet there is a bare possibility that he has done something of this sort. Tieck may have had indefinitely in his mind the date of Lukas' age, that is, the last date of which he had been thinking during the interview. Then, with a certain Romantic disregard of events, he had felt that Franz' query was in 1523 and so juggled with Rafael's age. But if this disregard of facts can be used here, it can also be used in Minor's argument. Minor, however, inadvertently took two different years as his starting point, 1520 and 1521 and this chronology cannot be made to jibe with the other dates in the story.

From the foregoing it will be seen that any attempt to fix the date of Sternbald's "musical wanderings" is beset with insuperable difficulties and Minor has erred in supposing that 1521 is a final and fixed date. The discrepancies point certainly not to 1521 but perhaps to 1523, or what is far more likely, to a shifting series of dates from 1520 to 1524, grouped by Tieck around a few historical events. Tieck himself was well aware of these difficulties, for he says in his preface (*op. cit.*), "Man rechne mir kleine chronologische Fehler nicht zu streng nach, man behandle dies kleine Buch nicht wie die Geschichte eines Staats."¹

G. H. DANTON.

Stanford University.

¹ Minor decides in favor of Tieck's authorship of "Ein Brief Joseph Berglingers in Phantasien über die Kunst" [D. N. L., vol. 145, p. 75 ff.], on internal evidence as shown in the mood of the letter and in spite of the contents

THE SOURCES OF STEVENSON'S BOTTLE IMP.

Into one corner of the great hall in Stevenson's house at Vailima was built a large safe that greatly exercised the imagination of the natives. It was supposed to be the prison of the Bottle Imp, the magical source of all Stevenson's fortune.¹ Soon after his arrival among the Samoans, he had written the tale in which that creature appears; and before it was given to English readers, the natives could read it in their own language in the *Mission* magazine.² They little guessed, nor did Stevenson himself know fully, the transformations undergone by the tale since it was told about the fire-side in remote German villages. Stevenson refers us to "that very unliterary product, the English drama of the early part of the century" for the central idea of the story which he so charmingly made over for a Polynesian audience. With the usual thoughtfulness of literary genius, he has left to the historian of literature his congenial task of hunting origins, referring to his source not more definitely than as "a piece once rendered popular by the redoubtable B. Smith." A few hundred years, and it might be difficult to find this piece and trace its sources. To-day it is easy enough, and it makes an instructive study in the art of story-telling.

The redoubtable B. Smith proves to be "O." Smith, a popular actor and stage-manager in the

which are Wackenroderish (pages 75 and 77 notes). One of the latest comments on the question by Helene Stöcker (*Palæstra*, xxvi, page 24), takes sides against Minor who however seems to be on confirmed by two slight internal facts which he does not mention. The two last lines at the bottom of page 78, "*So spott' ich über mich selbst—und auch dieses Spotten ist nur elendes Spielwerk*" are genuinely Tieckian and smack still of Abdallah and Lovell where the Romantic irony took this form. This is, if I understand Minor aright, something slightly different from the posing he mentions in his first note.

Tieck's predilection for the locution *gefangen hält* is mirrored in the *gefangen hielte* of page 79. Of course there is no good reason why Wackenroder should not have used the term; but I have never noted a use from him and have a round dozen from his friend, the best known of which is in the famous quatrain from Oktavianus without a mention of which no article on Tieck seems to be complete.

¹ Balfour's *Life of Stevenson*, II, 130.

² *Id.*, II, 155, 260.

two or three decades preceding the birth of Stevenson. His real name was Richard John Smith, and he got his nickname from the hit he made in the part of Obi Smith in *Three-fingered Jack*. (According to Forster, he was acceptable, in dramatizations of Dickens, in parts like Mantalini and Newman Noggs.) Grotesque and desperate characters were his specialty: in the burletta entitled *Die Hexen am Rhein*, he played the star part of Mons. Bilrin, a Belgian giant eight feet high; and he was the Mephistopheles of the *Dice of Death*.³ In 1828 he made the success of another burletta or "melodramatic romance," played at several different London theatres.⁴ This was the *Bottle Imp*, the immediate source of Stevenson's tale.

Obi Smith was never more "redoubtable" than

³ Clement Scott's *Drama of Yesterday and Today*, I, 14, 19. Michael Williams' *Some London Theatres: Past and Present*, p. 151. Another part taken by O. Smith was Graff, in *Valsha, or, The Slave Queen*, printed in the second volume of Webster's *National Drama*. For other parts see Williams, p. 143. For O. Smith as a stage manager, see James C. Dibdin's *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage*, p. 351, and Williams, p. 148. Was it a misprint in Stevenson? or was there possibly also a B. Smith famous in the same part of the *Bottle Imp*?

⁴ Genest, in 1830, was unaware of the publication of the *Bottle Imp*. In his *Account of the English Stage*, IX, 472-3, he notes the first performances at Covent Garden, beginning Oct. 17, 1828; and remarks the play was "seemingly not printed." It was, however, printed more than once, perhaps in the same year. The British Museum has a copy entitled: "The Bottle Imp, A dramatic romance in two acts. Written expressly for and adapted to Dyer Senior's characters and scenes only," with a woodcut frontispiece dated 25 Oct., 1828. London, published by J. Dyer, Sen. 25 pp. A copy in the Lenox library in New York has the following description on the title page: "The bottle imp. A melodramatic romance, in two acts. Produced at the Theatre Royal, English Opera House, July, 1828. Overture and music composed by G. H. B. Rodwell. . . . London: Chapman and Hall, "(1828?) 29 pp. 12°. The frontispiece consists of an etching by Pierce Egan, the younger, and is from a drawing taken during the representation of the play. This is apparently the form of the play reproduced in Benjamin Webster's *Acting National Drama*. London: Chapman and Hall. 1838. According to Adams' *Dictionary of the Drama*, the first performance was at the Lyceum Theatre, London, on July 7, 1828. The cast were practically the same at the various reported performances, being made up of members of the Lyceum company. Other performances are recorded during July and October, 1829 (Williams, p. 147).

in this part. His costume is described as a "tightly-fitting skin dress of a sea green, horns on the head, and demon's face, from the wrist to the hips a wide-spreading wing, extending or folding at pleasure." A frontispiece engraving in the book of the play presents the batlike creature in the midst of sulphurous smoke, triumphing horribly over his human victim. No doubt the imagination of young Stevenson could easily conjure up in all its vividness the scene as actually witnessed by the artist.

The book is printed from a stage copy of the play, and was not published until after the presentation of the successful piece. It was composed by R. B. Peake, Esq., a member of the Dramatic Authors' Society. Mr. Peake offers no information as to the source of his story, and so far as I know, this has never been pointed out.⁵ I think there can be no question the author made use of a tale entitled *The Bottle Imp*, found in the first volume of a somewhat obscure collection of *Popular Tales and Romances of the Northern Nations*, 1823.⁶ This anonymous work represents an early crop of translations from the German about the time when Blackwood's was printing its *Horae Germanicae*, and when DeQuincey and Carlyle were doing their best to interest English readers in German romance. It was in this very collection that DeQuincey seems to have published originally his tale from the German, *The Fatal Marksman*.⁷ Last summer, finding a

⁵ Adams says merely, quoting M. Williams: "The story was based upon the German legend, that the possessor of a bottle imp could command riches, power, and prosperity of every kind, at the mere wish; but that if he retained the spirit to the end of his life, his soul was forfeited to the evil one. Meanwhile he had the privilege of disposing of the bottle, provided he sold it for less than he gave."

⁶ London: Printed for W. Simpkin and R. Marshall, and J. H. Bohte. Copies of this work are in the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Boston Public, and the Congressional Libraries. Besides the title, various phrases and sentences common to the two (as opposed to the Roscoe translation mentioned below), given in a later note, will serve to mark this version of the story for the source of the play.

⁷ I had the same experience with this tale as Prof. Masson. In the Editor's Preface to vol. XII of the Edinburgh 1889-90 edition of DeQuincey, Professor Masson writes: "Having looked by mere accident into an anonymous . . . collection of 'Popular Tales and Romances,' . . . there, to

copy of this work in a Chicago book store, I was started on this little hunt. There is no indication in the book of the authors or translators of the several stories. But among other German writers mentioned in the preface is LaMotte Fouqué; and the *Bottle Imp* proves to be merely a translation of his tale of *Das Galgenmännlein*, slightly condensed and a bit altered in the conclusion. That the story was a popular one is shown by its inclusion in Thomas Roscoe's *German Novelists*, published three years later.⁸ There it bears the inappropriate title of *The Mandrake*. Roscoe's translation is more exact than that in the earlier work, but the earlier translator was much happier in his rendering of the title.⁹ 'The Bottle Imp'

our surprise, in vol. III, we found DeQuincey's *Fatal Marksman*, exactly as we now have it, both title and text, but without the name of either the original author or the translator. The inference is that one of DeQuincey's little commercial asides in 1823, when he was at his busiest in writing for the *London Magazine*, was this contribution to a collection of Tales from the German, and that, having a copy of it beside him in 1859, he thought it then worth reprinting just as it stood." Prof. Masson points out that DeQuincey makes no acknowledgment, in reprinting the story, of its being from the German. It is based upon the same German tale as the libretto of Weber's *Freischütz*—which, it is interesting to observe, made a sensational success at the Lyceum Theatre in the year of publication of this collection of tales (Williams, p. 140).

It is also interesting to find in this collection two of the tales included by Carlyle in his *German Romance* published four years later (1827). *The Spectre Barber* is a translation of Musäus' *Stumme Liebe* (Carlyle's *Dumb Love*); and *Auburn Egbert* is a translation of Tieck's *Der Blonde Eckbert* (Carlyle's *Fair-Haired Eckbert*). The titles will sufficiently illustrate the greater exactness of Carlyle in translation. I find no indication of acquaintance with this collection on the part of Carlyle, who indeed seems to have wished to include in his own collection pieces not yet translated.

Other pieces which I have identified are *The Treasure-Seeker* (Musäus' *Der Schatzgräber*), *Elfin-Land* (Tieck's *Die Elfen*), and *The Tale* (Goethe's *Märchen in Unterhaltungen Deutscher Ausgewanderten*). *Kibitz* is the same *Schwank* that Hans Christian Andersen has worked up with so much drollery in *Lille Claus og Store Claus*.

⁸ Four volumes. London, 1826. The tale is printed in vol. II, pp. 327-366.

⁹ The Blackwood reviewer (September, 1823) does not share my liking for this title. "Ill-chosen," he calls it; and it was doubtless his disapproval that led Roscoe to make in his translation the certainly much less happy choice.

stuck ; and it was on the tale so designated that the playwright founded his piece.

Some one with access to collections of German *Maerchen* may perhaps trace the kernel of Fouqué's story to some popular tale or tradition.¹⁰ Meanwhile it is interesting to follow the transformations of the story from Fouqué's version to the Samoan form.

The German tale relates how, during the Thirty Years War, a young German merchant, visiting Venice, is led to spend all his substance in riotous living. Among the revellers, is a Spanish captain, not so gay as the others. When Richard's money fails, the Spaniard draws him aside, and makes him a surprising offer,—an offer, namely, of the power of procuring as much money as he may desire. "I know not whether you are acquainted with a certain little creature, which they call a mandrake (*Galgenmännlein*). It is a very diminutive black looking imp, enclosed in a vial. Whoever possesses one of these creatures may by its means obtain whatever is most desirable in life, particularly an unbounded quantity of money. In return the Mandrake requires the soul of the possessor for his master Lucifer, provided he dies without having transferred the Mandrake into other hands. This can only be done by selling it, and that too for a smaller sum than the possessor himself has given for it. Mine cost me ten ducats, and if you will give me nine for it, 'tis yours."¹¹ After some debate, Richard consents to purchase the talisman for five ducats, and proceeds at once to prove its magic. With its assistance, he continues his life

of extravagant dissipation, in company with a Venetian bona roba named Lucretia. When reproached for his abandoned life, he exclaims, "Richard is my name, and my riches are so boundless that no expense in the world can exhaust them." (*"Reichard ist mein Name, und mein Reichtum ist so hart, dass ihm keine Ausgabe den Kopf einzustossen vermag."*) One remarkable property of the bottle is that, as often as it is thrown away, it returns to its owner, as the stones removed from Arthur's cairn returned to their proper place. This was proved one day when Lucretia threw it into a brook, and Richard shortly after found it in his pocket.

Richard is at length overcome with sickness, the result of his dissipations ; and while in a feverish state, he seems to see the impish vial dancing among the other medicine bottles near his bed. The imp is then heard singing a song of triumph over his victim. He begins to grow suddenly long and thin ; he crawls out of the bottle, and stretches his loathsome body upon that of Richard, like an incubus. Finally Richard wakes, sweating, to see a horrid black toad running into the bed clothes. He has had enough of the bottle imp, and proceeds to palm it off on his doctor for a *lusus naturae*. The doctor, however, soon discovers his bad bargain, and manages to sell the imp back to Richard by a ruse of his own. Similarly the imp is sold to Lucretia, but returns to poor Richard again. He now determines to seek another district in the effort to get rid of his unhappy wares. He goes to Rome, and lives sumptuously there, but is unable to find a purchaser. He enlists in the wars as a captain, and succeeds in selling the imp ; but he buys it back once more by mistake, paying for it now a farthing (heller), the coin of lowest known denomination. His soul is now beyond hope of salvation unless he can get some one to take his wares for a half-farthing. Everywhere he begs this boon with frantic insistence, until he comes to be known as the crazy half-farthing (*der tolle Halbheller*).

The conclusion displays all the grotesquerie of German supernatural romance. Richard is finally saved by a giant in blood red dress, mounted on a wild black horse, whom he meets at the horrible Black Fountain. This is an inky well in a valley reached through a darksome cave with withered

¹⁰ One thinks of the Devil on Two Sticks (*Diable boiteux*), the *Peau de Chagrin*, and the imprisoned djinn of the Arabian Nights ; but these do not take us far. (One may begin the search by consulting the notes to Grimm No. 99.)

¹¹ Quoted from Roscoe's translation. The other translation follows the text with almost the same fidelity, but differs in many details of phraseology, the play always agreeing with this anonymous version. The following sentence, for example, is exactly reproduced in the play. "I know not whether you are acquainted with certain little spirits, that are called bottle imps." Again, "Whoever possesses one of these (Bottle Imps) can command from it whatever worldly possessions he desires most." Both quotations from Act I, scene IV. The play and the anonymous translation agree in the un-English expression, "a less sum" for the "smaller sum" of Roscoe.

cypresses before its mouth in the manner of Boecklin. "It was as if the two cypresses were dried up with fright over the hateful gulf." There every Friday the giant washes himself in contempt of his creator. He is bound to the devil for 100,000 gold pieces per year; but this he finds insufficient for his needs, and he desires the unlimited supply of coin offered by the bottle imp. Moreover, being already damned beyond hope himself, he is glad to cheat the devil, and save the soul of Richard. Him he directs to a prince whose money has so depreciated in value that three of his farthings will exchange for but one good coin. And with one of these base coins he buys the bottle imp, and disappears walking up the cliffs like a fly.¹² Richard is now quite ready for reform. He marries a good woman, and is able, generations later, to tell his grandchildren the moral tale of the bottle imp.

An ideal subject for one of the musical melodramas that held the London stage in the 20's and 30's. Mr. Peake has summoned to his assistance the musical genius of Mr. Rodwell; and has arranged in his play some effective scenes for "O" Smith and his fellow-actors. Lucretia keeps her part and name. Richard is renamed Albert, with a loss of the German pun. He is given a servant Willibald, for the benefit of Mr. Keeley, the actor of character parts. This droll Dutchman makes a great deal of fun for the groundlings with his frequent allusions to his native village of Schlauchenhausen and to his uncle Schwellinbogel's bagpipes. He is made major domo of his master's sumptuous household, and is given a comic scene or two with those "merry devils," as he supposes them, the servants. A notion of the quality may be had from the following bit of dialogue between Willibald and Lucretia's maid Phillippa:

"*Phi.* You look admirably in your new dress, signor.

¹² In the anonymous translation, the conclusion has been slightly altered "so as to render it more satisfactory." A hollow voice from the Black Fountain announces that "Now then are all our labours frustrated, for he who while doomed to destruction could attempt the rescue of another may even yet be saved himself." But as the playwright has given an entirely new turn to the conclusion, this variation does not affect the form of the story in the play.

Wil. Flattery—many a man is seduced by flattery. But I won't be—tempting little devil, too—

Phi. You like our dwelling-place?

Wil. Your dwelling-place? never was there, thank mercy (*aside*) her dwelling-place.

Phi. Ah, signor, my mistress is very much attached to your master; (*mysteriously*) if I thought no one was near, I could unfold a tale.

Wil. (*aside*) Unfold her tail! No, no; remain as you are—no, don't unfold."

A whole new set of characters is introduced in the play in order to get the hero properly married in the end. These are the family of Marcelia, a maiden who has been betrayed by the German traveller. She is thus given an opportunity of playing a magnanimous, melodramatic part in saving the life of her betrayer.

Particularly clever is the way the playwright disposes of the bottle in the end. The nameless and fairly innocent Spanish officer of the German story has become a Nicola, a necromancer, whose many crimes and intimate knowledge of the black arts, set forth prominently at the start, make him a proper scapegoat. In the end, he is arrested by the ecclesiastical authorities and shut up in the prison of the Inquisition. The prison takes fire, and troops are summoned to guard the prisoners. German Albert, now a Venetian officer, is in command. In the midst of a lurid scene, aptly suggesting the destined torments of hell, thirsting Nicola begs for something to drink; and in his desperation, he buys back the fatal bottle with a coin of the lowest value in the world. Thereupon appears the fiend, seizes his victim "by the hair of the head," and they sink in a shower of fire, orchestra playing with doleful fury. Morality play come back to the London stage!

This then was the form of the story known to Stevenson, the suggestion for his *Bottle Imp*. The playwright had certainly used his materials with freedom, and turned out a series of scenes well adapted to the talents of the actors and the taste of the time. Mr. Williams still speaks with warmth, in 1883, of the enthusiasm aroused by this play. A far greater transformation the tale has undergone in the hands of Stevenson, till there remains scarcely anything but the original kernel of the

bottle imp. And yet it is interesting to trace some of the best traits of his tale to hints from the play.

The story has been given a new dress altogether. Time, place and names are changed beyond recognition. It is an Hawaiian, Keawe, who leaves his home on a pleasure trip and finds the wishing bottle in San Francisco. Keawe buys the bottle of an old man, who invites the ingenuous stranger into his house as he is passing by. The bottle sells for \$50. It was brought to earth, the old man tells him, by the devil, who sold it first of all to Prester John for many millions. Other owners have been Napoleon and Capt. Cook, and this accounts for their great successes. When Keawe wishes himself \$50, he gets the exact sum—forty-nine dollars American money, and one Chili piece. "That looks like the truth," said Keawe. He has the same experience with the bottle as German Albert. You can't get rid of it except by sale—it always comes back.

From this point, with one important exception, the tale has little in common with the earlier versions. On his return to Honolulu, Keawe finds himself heir to a wealthy uncle deceased.¹³ He builds himself a great house just to his liking, and then sells the bottle to a friend. He proceeds to fall in love with a beautiful girl, Kokua, whom he sees bathing. The courtship is brief, and they become engaged. And then at the apex of fortune and happiness, Keawe discovers that he is a leper!¹⁴ There is nothing now but to hunt down the wishing-bottle and buy it back. This Keawe succeeds in doing but alas! the price has fallen terribly, and he is obliged to buy for the desperately low sum of two cents. However, he wishes himself well, and is married to Kokua. But he cannot forget his peril, and life does not go happily

¹³ Stevenson may have had a hint for this timely death of Keawe's uncle from the parricide performed by Nicola under the influence of the fiend, and with rather vague relation to the wishing-bottle. In Stevenson's tale, the inference is that the death of the uncle was accomplished by the fiend in carrying out the wish of Keawe for a fine house. Very gently, by suggestion, the moral is conveyed that devil's help can be had only at the expense of devil's work.

¹⁴ Suggested by the sickness of Albert in the play. But while there the sickness has no essential place in the story, Stevenson makes it of prime importance for plot and of high dramatic interest.

with the young couple. Keawe at length explains the reason for his sadness, to the relief of Kokua, who had interpreted it as displeasure with her. She declares she will save her husband's soul; and being an educated woman, she comes to the rescue with the suggestion of coins lower than a cent. In search of the centime, they sail to the French islands, prepared to put on great style in order the better to "push the bottle."¹⁵ But in this they have no success, merely arousing suspicion of sorcery. Finally Kokua, to save her beloved spouse, determines to risk her own salvation; and persuading an old man to buy the bottle of Keawe for four centimes, she buys it of him for three. Keawe is greatly relieved, and indulges in tavern pleasures. But after a while he discovers his Kokua's sacrifice; and, not to be outdone in altruism and shrewdness, he buys the bottle back through a brutal drunkard of a boatswain. The boatswain pays two centimes, and Keawe is to pay the ultimate one. Back comes the drunkard to the tavern, with the devil's bottle buttoned in his coat, and drinking from another bottle in his hand. Keawe is lost beyond peradventure. But wonder of wonders! The drunkard will not sell. Warned and warned of the condition of ownership, he will not part with a talisman of such sovereign virtue. He reckons he is going to hell anyway, and he thinks he has a bargain. "You thought I was a flat, now you see I'm not. If you won't have a swallow of the rum, I'll have one myself. Here's your health, and good night to you!" So off he went down the avenue towards town, and there goes the bottle out of the story.

This drunkard was very likely suggested by a character of the play in the same scene that suggested the reciprocal sacrifices of Keawe and Kokua. Albert, now a soldier in the Venetian service, has found a purchaser for the bottle, a jolly fellow named Jomelli, who took it for a wine-flask. He guesses at its contents. "Is it schnaps, or schiedam?" And later he is represented stealing off the stage in happy intoxication. So much for a hint of Stevenson's boatswain. But Jomelli is not the scapegoat of the play. And more important is the latter part of the scene.

¹⁵ Thus reproducing an incident of the German tale not found by Stevenson in his play.

Jomelli and Albert have been gambling. Albert has pledged and lost even his canteen. And so he falls subject to an order that any soldier found on inspection without canteen shall suffer death. Sentence has passed when Albert's deserted mistress appears in camp and learns of her lover's plight from Jomelli. While the latter is speaking, the impish bottle undergoes a sudden transformation to a right canteen. Without more ado, Marcelia buys it and hastens to the place of execution. She is just in time to save her lover's life.¹⁶ And thereupon he is able to return suit by saving her soul. As he turns to look at her, he sees the fiend materialized extending his arms over her head. "Ah, the fiend!" he exclaims, "Marcelia, my beloved, my preserver, has purchased the fiend; never, never—it shall not remain one moment in her possession. And he quickly forces a coin into her hand, and takes back the fatal canteen." "Never shall thy generous soul be in danger; would I were free!"

The unexplained transformation of the bottle is absurd enough, and what follows of an orthodox style of melodrama. But the reciprocal rescue—though on Marcelia's side accomplished without any understanding of her risk—was the suggestion for the beautiful story of self-sacrifice in our Hawaiian family.

In all details of the narrative, Stevenson is his own inimitable self. The naïveté of the young Hawaiian is throughout delightful to an English reader; and the description of his Great House a copy-book model of American luxuries for the island natives. Nothing could be more stimulating to the imagination than the mysterious house in San Francisco, and the mysterious man "that looked forth upon him through a window so clear that Keawe could see him as you see a fish in a pool upon a reef." The treatment of the bottle is particularly good. We learn from the play that the bottle is transparent, and "a small black figure is moving about in it." Stevenson offers more for the imagination. It is a "round-bellied bottle with a long neck; the glass of it was white like milk, with changing rainbow colours in the grain. Withinsides some-

thing obscurely moved, like a shadow and a fire." The German tale and the play offer us a materialized demon of grotesque antics and well defined figure. Stevenson contents himself with noting his effect on those who saw him, declining all the claptrap business of the play. Keawe and his friend propose to have a look at the imp. "Now as soon as that was said, the imp looked out of the bottle, and in again, swift as a lizard; and there sat Keawe and Lopaka turned to stone." The most dramatic moment in the story is where Keawe, in the midst of his happiness, suddenly discovers his leprosy.

"Ever the latter end of joy is woe."

Before you know what has happened, you shudder and your heart stops beating.

"So the Chinaman had word, and he must rise from sleep and light the furnaces; and as he walked below, beside the boilers, he heard his master singing and rejoicing above him in the lighted chambers. When the water began to be hot, the Chinaman cried to his master: and Keawe went into the bath-room; and the Chinaman heard him sing as he filled the marble basin; and heard him sing, and the singing broken, as he undressed; until, of a sudden, the song ceased. The Chinaman listened, and listened; he called up the house to Keawe to ask if all were well, and Keawe answered him "Yes," and bade him go to bed; but there was no more singing in the Bright House; and all night long the Chinaman heard his master's feet go round and round the balconies without repose."

Morally the story is quite as completely transformed as in its outward appearance. Without any of the preacher's nasal tone, it must have served admirably, as Stevenson doubtless intended it, for the instruction of Samoan islanders in the art of living. The character of Keawe is a not less admirable model for being human. His honesty appears in his behaviour on the discovery of his disease, as the author thinks proper to point out. "Now you are to observe what sort of a man Keawe was, for he might have dwelt there in the Bright House for years, and no one been

¹⁶ Act II, scene iv. This incident is based on a somewhat similar one in the earlier tale, in which, however, there appears neither woman nor drunkard.

the wiser of his sickness ; but he reckoned nothing of that if he must lose Kokua. And again he might have wed Kokua even as he was ; and so many would have done, because they have the souls of pigs ; but Keawe loved the maid manfully, and he would do her no hurt and bring her in no danger." But later, though Keawe shows himself a Christian in the end, he does not always prove as honest with himself as Kokua. When the old man has bought the bottle, presumably for his own use, Keawe declines to have any pity for him, not wishing to think he has saved his own soul by the eternal ruin of another. He grows angry with his wife for dwelling on this consideration, the more so because of its truth. "Then Keawe, because he felt the truth of what she said, grew the more angry." The situation is full of dramatic irony when we consider it is Kokua whose soul is lost ; and the psychology is admirable all through this part of the tale. The scapegoat boatswain, obstinate in his own damnation, is an embodied moral.

But after all, I fear it was not the moral aspects of the tale that appealed to the author's Samoan neighbours. It was rather the magic and the practical that touched their imaginations. There is something pathetic in the thought that these natives, after reading the story, could still suppose the gentle and virtuous Stevenson to be the owner of so baneful a talisman.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH.

The University of Minnesota.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SESTINA.

Tradition ascribes the invention of this elaborate verse-form to the troubadour Arnaut Daniel and tradition in this case seems to be based on a passage in Dante, *De Vulgari eloquentia*,¹ II, 13 : "Unum est stantia, sine rithimo, in qua nulla rithimorum habitudo attenditur ; et huiusmodi stantiis usus est Arnaldus Danielis frequentissime, velut ibi : *Sem fos Amor de joi donar* ; et nos dicimus : *Al poco giorno*." A curious point in connection with this

passage, and one which appears to have been overlooked, is that while Dante's poem beginning *Al poco giorno* is undoubtedly a sestina, the one by Arnaut Daniel to which he refers is certainly not. It is a poem of six strophes of eight lines each (with an envoi of two lines) in which the same rhymes are used from strophe to strophe, but not the same rhyme-words, nor is there change of order. I shall attempt to explain this contradiction below. Diez, who mentions the passage,² says : "Dass unser Troubadour wirklich, wie man vorgiebt, der Erfinder dieser wunderlicher Liederform sei, darüber haben wir kein Zeugnis ; allein, da wir ebensowenig eine ältere Sextine aufweisen können, als die seinige, und alle Umstände für ihn sprechen, so müssen wir ihn forthin für den Erfinder gelten lassen." A. Stimming, in Gröber's *Grundriss*,³ speaks of "der Sextine, die von Arnaut Daniel erfunden ist."

Other scholars, however, modify this impression that the invention of the sestina was due to a happy inspiration of the troubadour Daniel. Thus Bartsch⁴ says : "Die Rundcanzone, *cansos redonda*, hat mit der Sextine die grösste Aehnlichkeit."

F. W. Maus⁵ in speaking of the single poem extant from the pen of Guillem de Bearn and of his use of the same rhyme-words in all its stanzas (rhyming them, however, with each other also within the stanza), adds : "und betrachte die bekannten 3 Sextinen von Arn. Daniel, Bert. Zorzi und Guill. de S. Gregori [the latter two being imitations of the first] als eine weitere Ausbildung dieser Reimspielerei." Even Diez⁶ had noted a poem of Guillem Peire de Cazals (to which I shall refer presently) as "ein Mittelding zwischen Sextine und Runde."

Now these statements are close to the truth, but they are mere opinions ; the facts are not marshalled, nor is any induction made.

¹ *Leben u. Werke der Troubadours*, ed. K. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1882, S. 287.

² *Provenzalische Litteratur*, S. 27. For further reference to this tradition see *La Vita e le Opere del Trovatore Arnaldo Daniello*, a cura di U. A. Canello, Halle, 1883.

³ *Grundriss zur Geschichte der provenzalischen Litteratur*, Elberfeld, 1872, S. 39.

⁴ *Peire Cardenal's Strophenbau*, Marburg, 1884, S. 49.

⁵ *Poesie der Troubadours*, 2te Aufl., ed. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1884, S. 103.

¹ Ed. P. Rajna, Firenze, 1896, p. 193.

I find the germ of the sestina in two characteristics of the Provençal lyric:

1. The so-called *rimas dissolutas* or *Körner*, which find their correspondences in successive strophes.

2. The tendency to reverse rhyme-order (simplest form *abba*), which is very common in Provençal verse.

These *Körner* form a scale from one up until they occupy the rhyme-places of the whole strophe, as in A. Daniel's poem referred to by Dante.

In the combination of these characteristics and their development into the sestina four principal stages may be noted, though it would not be difficult to distinguish other minor gradations.⁷

1. *Canso redonda*. This I regard as the primitive type, of obvious popular origin; form and name indicate the accompaniment of a circular dance. It consists of an indefinite number of strophes, the last rhyme of each being repeated in the first line of the next, except, of course, the last rhyme of all, which corresponds to the first rhyme of the poem. Cf. the poem of Peire Raimon de Toulouse in Bartsch, *Lesebuch*, pp. 64-65. This at least is the simplest form of this type; but within the type there is also a progressive development. First, the rhyme taken up is a simple rhyme, then *rime riche*, then the whole rhyme-word is repeated, and finally the whole line. It does not at all matter whether all these forms are called by the name *Canso redonda*. The principle is the same; connection of each strophe with the foregoing by repetition from the final line.

2. The next stage is the *Canso redonda encadenada*, in which all the rhymes of the first strophe are repeated in inverse order in the second, those of the second repeated similarly in the third, and thus throughout the poem. Cf. Raimon de Miraval in Mahn, *Gedichte*, 197.⁸ This form may also be regarded as belonging to the domain of popular poetry, or at least as representing the transition to *Kunstdichtung*.

3. With the poem of Guillem Peire de Cazals above referred to⁹ we reach the effort of an indi-

vidual artist. This poem has five six-lined stanzas and an envoi of three lines. The second strophe repeats not only the rhymes but the rhyme-words of the first, and in inverse order, the third those of the second, and so throughout the poem. Thus, first strophe: *astruc, vol, amistat, grat, col, aluc*; second: *aluc, col, grat, amistat, vol, astruc*; third: like the first, etc., the envoi repeating the rhyme-words of the last three lines of the fifth stanza.

4. From this to the sestina is but a step, and the change a very slight one. Instead of repeating the rhyme-words of the first strophe from the bottom up, Arnaut Daniel¹⁰ takes them alternately from bottom up and top down, thus:

1	6	3	5	4	2
2	1	6	3	5	4
3	5	4	2	1	6
4	2	1	6	3	5
5	4	2	1	6	3
6	3	5	4	2	1

This is the only innovation made by Daniel as compared with the form used by Peire de Cazals, except that the former brings into his *envoi* all six rhyme-words instead of only three.

There remains the question of dates. Of the four troubadours mentioned as illustrating the four stages in the development of the sestina, three were contemporary: Peire Raimon de Toulouse, fl. 1170-1200, Raimon de Miraval, fl. 1190-1220, Arnaut Daniel, fl. 1180-1200.¹¹ Of the fourth, Guillem Peire de Cazals, the dates are, I believe, unknown. In the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tome XIX, pp. 616-7, we read: "Rien n'indique l'époque à laquelle il appartient, à moins qu'on ne se fonde sur sa satire contre les seigneurs, genre de poésie devenu commun vers le milieu et la fin du XIII^e siècle." But even if it were proven that he lived at a later period, the fact would be unimportant. Since we do not possess the complete body of Provençal poetry, there is nothing to show that Guillem Peire de Cazals was the first to use the form referred to, and in any case the evolution of Romance poetic forms proceeds from simple to complex, not in the reverse direction.

Before concluding, I wish to revert briefly to the apparent contradiction in the passage quoted

⁷ See Bartsch, *Reimkunst der Troubadours in Jahrh. f. roman. u. engl. Litteratur*, I, S. 178 ff.

⁸ Also see Bartsch, *Reimkunst*, p. 183.

⁹ *Parnasse occitanien*, p. 237.

¹⁰ Canello, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

¹¹ See Diez, *Leben u. Werke*.

at the beginning of the paper from the *De vulgari eloquentia*. I am unwilling to believe that Dante committed an error and wrote *Sem fos amor* when he meant *Lo ferm voler*. I prefer to think that he considered both poems as belonging to the same type, the distinguishing characteristic of which was, for him, rhyme-sequence from strophe to strophe but not within the strophe. A similar variant would be the poem of Guillem de Bearn also mentioned above, and still another a poem by Raimon de Miraval which runs: a b b c c d d e, e b b c c d d a.¹²

Such collateral forms were doubtless of importance in the development of the sestina, but the four types which I have emphasized would seem to represent the direct line of growth. If my solution be correct, it simply affords another slight evidence of the gradual evolution of literary forms.

F. J. A. DAVIDSON.

University of Toronto.

BROWNING.

The Old Yellow Book: Source of Browning's The Ring and the Book, in Complete Photo-reproduction, with Translation, Essay, and Notes, by Charles W. Hodell. Published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, July, 1908.

This is a solid quarto of over 600 pages, admirably printed on excellent paper. As a frontispiece, it has the splendid portrait of Browning done by his son in 1883, representing the poet as seated, with the Old Yellow Book in his hands and resting upon his knee. Other illustrations are the Franceschini coat of arms, a portrait of Guido Franceschini from a sketch made shortly before his execution, and the record of Pompilia's death from the register of San Lorenzo in Lucina. Still another, unnoted in the Table of Contents, is the autograph of Browning, in a bold hand, with the Greek of Pindar's First Olympian, lines 111 (part) and 112, 'Her strongest-wingèd dart my Muse hath yet in store.'

¹² Herrigs *Archiv*, 33, S. 440.

The book contains in order: (1) The Old Yellow Book; (2) Translation of the Old Yellow Book; (3) Translation of the Secondary Source; (4) Translation of the Casanatense Version of the Franceschini Murder; (5) The Making of a Great Poem—an Essay on the Relationship of Book and Poem; (6) Corpus of Topical Notes; (7) Line-index to Notes; (8) Subject-index.

Apart from indexes, the work, it will be seen, falls into four parts—the photo-reproduction, a series of translations, that of the Old Yellow Book being much the longest, an essay of 65 pages, and 44 pages of notes.

The old print of the reproduction looks properly crabbed. We are told by the editor that the old leaf-numbering has been clipped away in photographing, and its place supplied by modern line-numbering; and also that certain words and letters have been supplied or made more legible in the reproduction, or, as the editor expresses it, 'Certain defects due to creases in the pages of the Book had to be cut in by hand.' There are, the editor tells us, numerous typographical faults in the original, and we are prepared to believe it.

The translations are, on the whole, sufficient for the general purpose of the book, to make clearer Browning's use of his material. Much, however, would remain to be done by a translator who should endeavor to render every line correctly and intelligibly. As Professor Hodell himself says, not only have intricate periods been broken up, but legal terminology has been Anglicized rather than translated, professional mannerisms have been rendered freely, and citations have been omitted. He complains that 'certain Italian colloquialisms are shrouded in obscurity,' that the love-letters are at times unintelligible, and that the syntax, idiom, and diction of the original are barbarous. He is thus, by his own confession, unequal to making a critical translation of the book, and this fact is brought into a clearer light by his statements on p. 4 of his preface: 'Nor is the purpose linguistic—to study the crabbed Latinity and the colloquial Italian of the volume. I have therefore felt that no glossary was needed, and have omitted etymological and philological [?] annotation.' This frank avowal renders it unnecessary for the reviewer to point out instances in

detail of renderings which could hardly be regarded as adequate save with reference to the purpose which the editor designates.

But even with this purpose in mind, one wishes now and again for somewhat greater technical scholarship on the part of the translator. Let one illustration suffice. In the powerful scene where the Pope decides the doom of the murderer, there is no question but that Browning conceives of the Pope as alone, and as signing the death-warrant with his own hand. This is evident from the description of the scene in the first canto, and from the lines near the end of the tenth :

'Who is upon the Lord's side?' asked the Count.
I, who write—

'On receipt of this command,
Acquaint Count Guido and his fellows four
They die to-morrow.' . . .

Carry this forthwith to the Governor!'

and again placed beyond question by the first canto :

So said, so done—
Rather so writ, for the old Pope bade this,
I find, with his particular chirograph,
His own no such infirm hand, Friday night.

These assumptions of the poet rest on passages in the three letters here printed on pp. CCXXXV, CCXXXVII-VIII, and CCXXXIX-XL, and translated on pp. 190-191. The sentences which bear most directly on this point are, in Professor Hodell's translation, as follows :

[Letter I]

'But since the Sanctity of Our Lord [the Pope] did not deem it wise to postpone the execution of the sentence already decreed, he has seen best by special writ to make denial of any clerical privilege.'

[Letter II]

'But the Pope yesterday issued his warrant.'

[Letter III]

'Monsignor signed of his own accord the warrant.'

To these correspond, as nearly as I can decipher the handwriting, the following originals :

[Letter I]

'Ma giudicando espediente La S^{ta} di N. S. [Santità di Nostro Signore] il non differire l'esecuzione della sentenza già destinatagli hebbe per bene con Chirografo particolare denegare ad ogni Priuilegio Clericale.'

[Letter II]

'Il Papa passò ieri il chirografo.'

[Letter III]

'Monsignore . . . motu proprio sottoscrisse il chirografo.'

It will be observed that the word *chirografo* is once translated 'writ,' and twice 'warrant,' and that the Pope seems clearly designated as the writer in the first two letters, whatever may be said of the last.

Commenting (p. 327) on Browning's words (l. 346),

I find, with his particular chirograph,

Professor Hodell says : 'Browning merely anglicizes the words of the first letter (B., ccxxxv): "*chirografo particolare*." This of course is utterly unintelligible as English idiom. The words seem to refer to the special writ of condemnation, the order for the execution. Spelled cheirograph [?] at RB., XII, 258.' This last reference is to Browning's translation, or paraphrase, of the relevant parts of Letter I :

But ere an answer from Arezzo came,
The Holiness of our Lord the Pope (prepare!)
Judging it inexpedient to postpone
The execution of such sentence passed,
Saw fit, by his particular chirograph,
To derogate, dispense with privilege.

But who signed the chirograph, according to Letter III? Professor Hodell makes it clear that he thinks it was the Pope in Letter I, as well as in Letter II; but he leaves us in the dark with respect to the Monsignore of Letter III. Since the same act is referred to in all three letters, one would certainly suppose that 'Monsignore' designated the Pope. If this is not correct, should there not be some note to suggest who is meant by the word? And if correct, should not the translation be explicit on the point?

Now just here is a place where a little 'etymological and philological annotation' would be of service. If 'particular' be taken in the *New English Dictionary's* meaning 2, and 'chirograph' in the same dictionary's meaning 1. d ('One of the three forms in which the will of the Papal See is expressed in writing'), hardly any difficulty will remain.

To be sure, it would be better to have more exact information. If Professor Hodell had turned, for instance, to so accessible a book as Moroni's *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastica*, under the word *Chirografo*, he would have found a reference to the work of a learned Papal jurist of the 17th century, Teodoro Amydenio, who thus defines the word: 'Nihil aliud est, quam cedula nostra propria manu subscripta, et semper solet concipi lingua vernacula, subscibitur tamen lingua latina, videlicet: *Urbanus Papa VIII*, quæ subscriptio in Chirographo adjicitur in fine. In litteris in forma Brevis ponitur a principio, et non scripta de manu Papæ.' From another part of the article he might have learned that a chirograph might be issued either in the interests of the Apostolic Camera, or in response to the request of an individual, or *motu proprio*. On consulting this expression in its appropriate place, he could have found that it, like Chirographum, is a technical term; and, as we have seen, one that is used in Letter III.

It follows that 'writ' is too general a term, and 'warrant' too specific; and that Browning, in confining himself to 'chirograph,' did precisely the best thing possible. And it follows, moreover, that the 'Monsignore' of Letter III can be no other than the Pope himself. The moral of all which is obvious.

To Professor Hodell's Essay little exception can be taken, either as to substance or manner. It is the most original part of his book, and as good as any.

The notes are confined to adducing the correspondences between passages of the poem and those of the original on which they are based. They are adequately done, and will be useful to all who wish to study Browning's artistry in the poem with minute care.

The Carnegie Institution, which has sometimes

been criticized for bestowing a disproportionate share of its funds upon works in physical science, has a right to allege this exception with some complacency. The book will serve its purpose, will enhance the reputation of its editor, and will illustrate a munificence which, now that a beginning has been made, will more frequently, we may hope, be directed toward those enterprises which directly concern the spirit of man.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

LASSERRE, PIERRE: *Le Romantisme français; Essai sur la révolution dans les sentiments et dans les idées au XIX^e siècle*. Nouvelle édition, avec une préface de l'auteur. One vol. in 12°. Paris, 1908. (Mercure de France.)

The vagaries of the Romantic generation have been a target of criticism ever since Nisard; but it was left to sum up the negative point of view, organize it under a general principle, and round it out into a sort of new *Entartung*. We lacked a philosophical generalization of the movement; we lacked a criticism keen enough to show us the evil that the Romantic spirit has left in the life of to-day.

This is what M. Lasserre has done, and he has done it well. He has given us, not a history of a literary school, but, as the subtitle of his volume indicates, a philosophical study: he has dissected the Romantic subjectivity and studied it, psychopathologically, "dans ses réalités essentielles et génératrices." Romanticism is Rousseauism; "Rien dans le Romantisme qui ne soit du Rousseau. Rien dans Rousseau qui ne soit romantique." The title of the first part, *La ruine de l'individu*, indicates the critic's attitude toward the arch-apostle of Romanticism. "Ne s'exhale-t-il pas de toutes ces fantaisies une odeur de cadavre?"—is the conclusion he draws from a study of Rousseau's ideas.

M. Lasserre then traces the development of the Romantic subjectivity in the pre-Romantic generation, following, as one might follow the history of a plague, the successive steps of the disease; noting everywhere the action of the 'virus'—

"cette corruption intégrale des hautes parties de la nature humaine qu'on appelle Romantisme." With Senancour and in the Faust-mood, the malady is a solitary one, corroding the intellect and the heart (*La Chimère*); with others, the disease cannot but translate itself in terms of action. Hence a new caption in our analysis, *La corruption des passions*. We begin the clinic with Benjamin Constant (*La manie des passions*); Chateaubriand follows under the rubric *Le faste des passions et le splendeur du faux*; then Mme. de Staël, as the archetype of George Sand, furnishes the material for a chapter on *Le Sacerdoce de la femme*, a cutting satire of feminine ideals in modern conceptions of life. All of these writers, together with Lamartine, to whom, as a 'demi-classique,' the critic is much more lenient, are not precursors of Romanticism; they are integral parts of the movement; and the only originality of '1830,' says M. Lasserre, was to carry this anarchy of the feelings into the domain of ideas.

The discussion of *Les Idées romantiques* occupies the last two-thirds of the book. We take up the literature of 1830; we study its types, its 'hommes fatals,' its déclassés, its monsters; then, with Chateaubriand as a text, we consider its artistic innovations (*La théorie de l'emphase romantique*). *L'emphase au théâtre* shows us the melodramatic nullity of Hugo's plays; *La Lyrique romantique* discusses the lack of content in his verse. A chapter on Romantic love retraces the history of de Musset, and a discussion of Alfred de Vigny criticises the Romantic conception of genius and the mob.

Yet the true perspective, insists M. Lasserre, magnifies, not '1830,' but the sentimental revolution which preceded it; not the *Préface de Cromwell*, but the essential realities of the new spirit. "Ruine psychique de l'individu, eudémonisme lâche, chimérisme sentimental, maladie de la solitude, corruption des passions, idolâtrie des passions, empire de la femme, empire des éléments féminins de l'esprit sur ses éléments virils, asservissement au moi, déformation emphatique de la réalité, conception révolutionnaire et dévergondée de la nature humaine, abus des moyens matériels de l'art pour masquer la paresse et la misère de l'invention"—these are the real principles of the new school. "Far more important than the con-

fusion of 'genres' is the confusion of categories of thought and feeling; the confusion of love with religion, of passion with virtue (in *La nouvelle Héloïse* and *Corinne*), the confusion of poetry with theology (*Génie du Christianisme*), the confusion of religious eloquence with philosophic truth in Cousin; the confusion of revery and history in Michelet, and generally speaking, the confusion of the 'Moi' with humanity itself, with the universe, or even with the Deity." And finally—"Le Romantisme est la décomposition de l'art, parce qu'il est la décomposition de l'homme."

We next take up the relation between Romanticism and the ideas put forward by the French Revolution. A 'contre-révolutionnaire,' an aristocratic liberal, M. Lasserre points out what 1793 really meant to France, a loss of intellectual solidarity and effective strength. He discusses Michelet as a type of the Romantic 'philosopher' and theorist, and shows us how the spirit of Michelet and 'Romantic Messianism' has invaded the century. A study of the doctrine of perfectibility and evolution enforces this point, and the book concludes with a discussion of the influence of German pantheism in forwarding the intellectual anarchy of contemporary France. Needless to add that M. Lasserre finds Romantic subjectivity everywhere, in the pessimism of the Naturalistic school, in the reaction of the eighties, in the manifold tendencies of the present day.

No bare analysis, of course, can show the logical weight, the force of personal conviction in the thesis sustained by M. Lasserre in five hundred and forty-three pages. Depicting as he does the ideal course of an epidemic, his picture is far more striking than any impartial portraiture of the actual victims could be. He studies his malady as though life were not one of the conditions of disease. Yet the Romantic school had life, and some of its work has life to-day. M. Lasserre says, for instance: "Ne cessons de rappeler que l'objet de notre investigation c'est le Romantisme, et que Vigny n'est intervenu que comme sujet éminent." And again, speaking of Hugo: "On a essayé en somme d'expliquer pourquoi on ne l'aime pas" (page 275). Even those of us who care least for Victor Hugo may well object to

such a manner of disposing of the great Romantic poet. The spirit of antithesis is fatal to impartiality and truth, but perhaps not less fatal than the spirit of a thesis.

As a thesis, however, a moral indictment of Romantic ideals, such a book was certainly needed. The average reader will find it an admirable supplement to Brandes, and a good antidote for his too fervent enthusiasm. It is too much to hope, perhaps, that the volume will reduce the disproportionate amount of nineteenth century literature in our curricula, or free our text-book biographies from their present excess of superlatives.

A recent English essayist has said: "To have sympathy with emotion is far easier than to have sympathy with thought"—an epigram which, after all, remains the best explanation of the strength of the Romantic tendency. The rise of Romanticism was inevitable; the Revolution brought into the reading public a mass of untrained readers, readers that preferred Ducray-Duminil and Pixérécourt to Racine, and the older hierarchy of taste was thrust aside.

Indoctus quid enim saperet liberque laborum
Rusticus urbano confusus, turpis honesto?

The result of all this was the crudities of the popular school, the melodramas and the feuilleton-novels. No one will object to having M. Lasserre demolish these masterpieces—would that he could! But the finer side of Romanticism, that renaissance of the imagination which revived the spirit of poetry and enriched the media of art, cannot be denied or set aside; it remains as the permanent gift of the Romantic school.

And by a sarcasm of destiny, something of this Romanticism survives, alas, in M. Lasserre. Even he has not escaped the contagion of Rousseau and his crew. His chapter headings, his epithets, the lyric rush of his style, are at times little short of Hugoesque. But it must be confessed that in dealing with that linguistic anarchy, a more than Renanesque niceness would have been needed to keep the hand of the dyer clean.

LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS.

University of Tennessee.

Chamisso's Werke, herausgegeben von Dr. HERMANN TARDEL. Kritisch durchgesehene und erläuterte Ausgabe in drei Bänden. Leipzig und Wien, Bibliographisches Institut, s. a. [1908-09].

Tardel's edition of Chamisso is confessedly neither definitive nor complete. The preface calls attention to the features that chiefly distinguish it from its most recent predecessors: following in general arrangement the fifth Weidmann edition of 1864, it presents the poems in a better order than Koch, and it offers a better text than Walzel; it contains three poems as yet unprinted, and its *Nachlese zu den Gedichten*, gathering together from a great variety of sources all the poems printed subsequently to the edition of 1864, leaves little to be desired in the direction of completeness. Chamisso's prose is somewhat more fully reprinted in Koch's edition; but Tardel, with a reprint of the *Tagebuch zur Reise um die Welt*, the more important passages of the *Bemerkungen und Ansichten*, the preface to the translations from Béranger, and half a dozen *Vermischte Aufsätze*, besides *Adelberts Fabel* and *Peter Schlemihl*, offers material enough to represent Chamisso as a prose writer in all but his works in natural science.

The apparatus of variant readings is fuller than has heretofore been available, the *Anmerkungen* appended to the second volume teem with useful information concerning sources and other literary relations; there are explanatory foot-notes to all the volumes, a general introduction on Chamisso's life and works, and particular introductions to the main divisions of the edition.

Apart from the merits of an accurate text, the editor naturally attaches the greatest importance to his introductions and his notes. The general introduction lacks something of the literary charm of Walzel's—with which, however, it reveals a certain likeness—perhaps for the very reason that the writer is often too manifestly striving for literary effect. It is more biographical than Walzel's, and is more specific in the indication of influences, as might be expected after the studies in Chamisso that Tardel has published elsewhere. The French element in general, and the spirit of

Rousseau in particular are especially emphasized; but full justice is also done to the effect upon Chamisso of his life in Germany and his association with Germans. The special introduction to the poems suffers from a certain suggestion of overestimate, and from a somewhat too schematic classification. The other introductions are brief and objective: Tardel waives a discussion of the meaning of Peter Schlemihl's shadow.

Explanatory foot-notes are supplied in less abundance and with less judgment to the first volume than to the other two. Volumes II and III contain more references to persons and events than volume I; but the poems in volume I are those for which most readers will care. It is not easy to see for whom the explanations are necessary that *Rosskamm* is equivalent to *Rosstäuscher* (I, 137) and that *Kummet* is *eine Art Halsgeschirr für Zugpferde* (I, 152); nor how readers to whom Moses Mendelssohn is introduced as the author of *Phädon* (I, 232) can be expected to know who Adam Riese was (I, 85). To the history and the setting of the poems the editor obviously gave more attention than to the interpretation of details in them. But, after all, Chamisso is not obscure; and Tardel's edition of his principal works is the handiest that we now have.

W. G. HOWARD.

Harvard University.

The Love-sick King by ANTHONY BREWER, edited from the quarto of 1655 by A. E. H. SWAEN, in *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*, 1907, XVIII.

Mr. A. E. H. Swaen's publication of *The Love-sick King* by Anthony Brewer is the first scholarly edition of this play. Excepting a few impossible details, the editor has reprinted the text as in the original. The title-page is a slightly enlarged facsimile.

The story of *The Love-sick King* tells of the infatuation of King Canutus for Cartesmunda, the fair nun of Winchester; how the victorious Danes are stayed by its continuance; and how the fair nun being slain, Canutus is defeated but gener-

ously permitted by his conqueror Alfvred to return to Denmark.

Of the writer of this play virtually nothing more is known, says Mr. Swaen, than what is to be found in *The Dictionary of National Biography*. In this but one definite statement regarding the dramatist is made, and that is that *The Love-sick King* was, according to the title-page, "Written by Anth. Brewer, Gent." To the life of Brewer as found in *The Dictionary of National Biography* Mr. Swaen adds that he "must have been well acquainted with the local history of Newcastle"—the town in which much of the narrative of the play occurs; that it is "very probable that he resided there for some time"; and that we cannot help thinking the play "must have been written for a Newcastle audience." While Mr. Swaen has thus far induced us to give a great deal of credence to these remarks, he immediately dispels all belief in them by saying, "Unfortunately we are here transgressing on the domain of guesses"; and we are left, as we began, with the sole fact of Brewer's life that *The Love-sick King* was "Written by Anth. Brewer, Gent."¹

Although *The Love-sick King* was printed in 1655, Mr. Swaen assigns the drama to "1605, or at least to a not much later date." His reasons are, first, that there is perhaps a trace of the influence of *Macbeth* in *The Love-sick King* in the name of Malcolm, which occurs in both tragedies; second, that there is perhaps an evidence of the influence of this same play in the parallelism of Shakespeare's "Come in, tailor; here you may roast your goose" and Brewer's "they say a Taylor burnt his Goose"; and, third, that there is "a certain amount of similarity" between the lives and the fortunes of Thornton in *The Love-sick King* and of Whittington in *The History of Richard Whittington*, which was entered in the *Register of the Stationers' Company* in 1605.²

The play Mr. Swaen classifies under Professor Schelling's headings of "pseudo-history and folklore" and "biographical chronicle play."³ As regards the pseudo-historical part of the drama the editor says that nothing is known of any

¹ See for this paragraph *Introduction*, p. vi.

² See for this paragraph *Introduction*, p. ix.

³ See Professor Felix E. Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play*.

amour between King Canutus and a nun Cartes-munda. Furthermore, there is no nun by the name of Cartesmundia known to have lived at Winchester. In the time of Cæsar there is mentioned a "Queene of the Brigantes" by name of Cartismandua. She had illicit escapades. It is not known whether this personage became the prototype of Brewer's nun. Mr. Swaen says, "The name *Cartesmundia* Brewer may, however, have taken from J. Speed."⁴ In the biographical chronicle Thornton is the hero. He is an historical personage and was an influential citizen of Newcastle in the fourteenth century. Mr. Swaen thus puts the facts concerning these three important persons of the play: "Thus truth and untruth are mixed: Thornton who flourished under Henry IV is represented as living in the reign of Canute; Canute who was victorious and reigned over England till his death in 1035 is represented as being defeated by Alfred, who died in 901!"⁵

Although much of the play is verse, almost the entire original copy is printed as prose. Mr. Swaen makes no general attempt to correct the consequent disorder, but instead refers to "the book of Dr. van Dam and Dr. Stoffel."⁶ The editor, though making several suggestions in the *Notes*, dismisses the whole subject with the perfunctory remark that "The metre reminds us of Fletcher's: we often find short and long lines varying the regular length of the pentameter."⁷

As to the play as literature this is all that Mr. Swaen has to say: "Little need be said with regard to the literary value of the play. It is interesting on account of its threefold plot: historical-biographical (Thornton); pseudo-historical (Canutus); legendary (Grim the Collier). Aesthetic value it has none."⁸ With this last remark in mind, in fairness to Brewer, we should realize that in the play there is so felicitous a couplet as

"Canutus arms, a while shall be thy Tomb,
Then gold inclose thee till the day of Doom."

In this a pleasing melody arises from the inter-

mingling of the assonance of *a*'s and of *o*'s, of the minor tones of *e*'s and of *i*'s, of *l*'s, and of the alliteration of *d*'s and of *t*'s. More than mere commonplace is this passage of Canutus on Cartesmundia:

"Here was it that I saw that blazing Star . . . *Hofman*, her looks are heaven; her eyes are *Cupid's* darts; Go bring her to me: Art not gone yet slave? It is an Embassie too good for *Hermes*, the Herald of the gods: Thou meet Lightning, yet on thou must, . . . Were *Hellen* now alive, this Maid alone would stain her beauty and new *Troy* should burn, *Paris* would dye again to live to see her: O bring me her, Dull slave with reverence: Let not the Sun be more out-worshipp'd by the tann'd *Barbarian*."

Mr. Swaen in his *Misprints in the Original Text* is not complete and consistent. For example, the error of "*repair'st* for *repair'd*," l. 1586, is not mentioned under this heading. Some misprints occur in this list and again in the *Notes* as in l. 658 and l. 1339. Furthermore, an explanation of these mistakes seems only natural. "*Ethelred*" could be the name of another person introduced, as well as a misspelling of Etheldred. "*Manet*" for *Manent* may not be evident to every possible reader of *The Love-sick King*.

The *Notes* are in some respects a disappointment. If the number of notes was limited, then more important ones have been omitted than "The *s* of *us* is inverted," l. 53; or "The *C* of *Cartes* and *Canut* is bigger than elsewhere," ll. 222-3. Such a comment as "There is no period after *Ent* . . . *Edel* has only one *l* here," l. 83, seems useless, for we presume the reprint to be correct in every part; if, perchance, typographical errors have occurred, they are supposed to be rectified in "Readers are requested to correct the following errors in the text." The mistakes of "*Randolfe*" in the text for "*Randal*" in the "Persons of the Play" and of "*Alablaster*," l. 842, for *alabaster*, are nowhere mentioned. It seems there should be a note on "*Poles*," l. 1567. Three possible meanings are suggested. Lines 1276-7 are too vague not to require comment. There is this trivial remark on a word in line 864: "*Frezland*, no doubt so spelt to suggest

⁴See J. Speed, *The Historie of Great Britaine under the Conquests of the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans*.

⁵See for this paragraph *Introduction*, pp. ix-xii.

⁶Dr. van Dam and Dr. Stoffel, *W. Shakespeare*, the chapters on prosody.

⁷See *Introduction*, p. xiii.

⁸See *Introduction*, p. xiv.

derivation from 'freeze.' Is there any more justification for this than for the one that in those days of variable spelling "*Freezland*" was Friesland? Again, attention might have been called to the following metrical scheme of lines 435-6:

Be gone, be gone,
My Juggy, my Puggy,
Be gone my Love, my Dear,
My Money is gone,
And ware I have none,
But one poor Lamb-skin here.

In the original text Brewer designated only "Scen. i" of the first act. The twelve, that we have found, might have been indicated in the *Notes*. Lastly, although all the characters of the drama as "*Donald*," "*Nuns*," etc. are not mentioned in the "Persons of the Play," nothing is said of this.

In fine, adverse criticism aside, Mr. Swaen in his edition of *The Love-sick King* has furnished the student of our earlier literature an excellent text, he has appended valuable information, and he has put into our hands a most scrupulous reprint of one of the Elizabethan plays.

CHARLES K. MESCHTER.

Lehigh University.

Island in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Von PAUL HERRMANN. Two vols. Leipzig, Engelmann, 1907.

The critic of Paul Herrmann's *Island*—unless indeed one of a band whose members may be reckoned on the fingers of one's hands—must perforce start out with the admission of partial incompetence to do justice to all its parts; especially if the opportunity has not been granted him to see far off Isafold with his own eyes. The following remarks are written with this reservation.

Good books and articles on Iceland have been rapidly multiplying of late, thanks to the recent considerable improvements in communication, until, with the appearance of the sketch in Baedeker's *Scandinavia* (1909), the island, from being a terra incognita, has advanced to take its place with the regular 'civilized' tourist countries. Herrmann's book, containing

as it does the very best materials culled from the works of his numerous predecessors, marks this epoch in but another way. We hope and rather imagine that it will be the last of the kind, and that henceforth travel, descriptions, and impressions on the one hand, and scientific treatises on the other, will be more clearly separated than has been the case so far, in most books on Iceland.

Herrmann, who is a teacher at the gymnasium of Torgau, was enabled to undertake this expensive journey by the generosity of the Prussian Department of Education. Originally planned only as the record of his experiences in the rarely visited South and East, the book was made to include a general cultural and physical conspectus of the whole island, with especial attention to the localities of the Sagas.

The result has been, unavoidably perhaps, rather unfortunate. Many repetitions are necessitated, and *e. g.*, the accompanying Saga accounts are pulled to pieces again and again to illustrate now this point now that. Moreover, though roughly divided into I) Land und Leute, and II) Reisebericht, and however reliably compiled, the book suffers by its twofold nature. The reader desiring exact information will prefer to get it from the respective authorities; whereas the reader desiring bright narrative and telling word pictures will fight shy of the frequent discussions of moot questions, and, we fear, skip also large portions of the very painstaking journal which—as the whole of the ca. 650 pages—is, to be sure, reasonably interesting and instructive, but also entirely devoid of humor. And that, we beg to submit, is a serious matter in a book attempting to give an exhaustive treatment of a people famed for their swift and fierce repartee and rich Celtic humor.

Best, perhaps is the treatment of recent developments in Icelandic art and literature, with the welcome translations, by the author, of nineteen new lyrics, and the appreciation of Indriði Einarsson's dramatic production. Valuable features are also the interspersed biographies of eminent men, and the chapter on the relations of Iceland with Germany (where he misses a trick, though, in failing to give an account of the picturesque personality of the skald Sighvatr Thorðarson and his wanderings).

Considering the multifarious information gathered in these volumes, there seem to be remark-

ably few errors of statement or fact. Only a few peccadilloes have been noted, such as when the author categorically refers to Eystein Ásgrímsson's 'Lilja' as "das innigste kunstvollste Gedicht des Mittelalters";¹ or asserts that the waterfalls of Iceland contain "a thousand million horsepower" which is more than doubtful, immense though their potential convertible energy unquestionably is. In this connection it is to be regretted that the author does not inform us of the probable attitude of the Icelandic legislature on the concession and acquisition (by foreign capital) of these sources of future wealth, in view of the fact that 'Vandfall-politik' has been, for some time already, an absolutely vital issue in the other Northern countries.

A more serious shortcoming is a certain lack of correlation, various customs and institutions being discussed as specifically Icelandic which really are pan-Scandinavian; e. g., the scheme of housing in separate buildings for the several purposes, the system of naming, features of pronunciation (cf. below), and the ancient sport of horse-fighting (hestavíg) put an end to in 1627 (which, by the way, was practiced in Telemarken down into the eighteenth century).

Most surprising is the author's exhibition of 'prejudiced phonetics.' He greatly dislikes the modern pronunciation of old *rn* (and *nn*) as *ddn*, and of *rl* (and *ll*) as *ddl* which, he opines, is neither beautiful nor historically justifiable (!). And yet a very closely allied sound² is daily produced by millions of E. Norwegians and Swedes, as well as Scandinavian *u*, of whose existence Herrmann seems entirely unaware. The pronunciation of *á* as *au* finds more favor in his eyes as "historisch eher berechtigt" (!).

The author's powers of original observation are not large. He definitely declines to venture an opinion on the characteristics of the people as a whole, yet fails to give any but idealized accounts of the individuals he meets—a slightly sentimental attitude, begotten in many, it seems, by the pathetic history and, after all, dubious outlook of that sympathetic little nation.

There are good indices; but it is to be regretted that a list of the numerous books used and mentioned was not added.

LEE M. HOLLANDER.

Ann Arbor, Mich.

¹ Uncritically quoted from Mogk, *Grundriss*, II, p. 714.

² Cf. Sievers, *Phonetik*, § 321.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON "FEELDES" IN THE *Knight's Tale*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—To Mr. Gibbs's references in *Modern Language Notes* for November (xxiv, 197-8), may be added:

Eche man bare a sheeld
So freshly depaynted that all the feld
Enleymed was of this fresh aray.

—*Partonope*, vv. 6374 ff.

.I. escu d'or ot Caradox
A orleure clere et fine,
Tout le pais en enlumine.

—*Perceval li Gallois*, vv. 13512-4 (Potvin, III, 154).

La dipintura è sì ricca e polita,
Che d'or tutto il giardino alluminava.

—Bojardo, *Orlando Innamorato*, I, 6, 53.

La veisseiz maint bon conrei,
Maint buen cheval baucet et sor,
Et maint chier garnement a or,
De dras de soie et de cendé
Maint chier blialz d'orfreis bendé,
Tot li pais en reflambeie.

—*Roman de Troie*, vv. 13000 ff. (ed. July, II, 184).

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Cambridge, Mass.

"NEVER LESS ALONE THAN WHEN ALONE."

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Here is an early use of the thought, sixty years at least before Prof. Cook's earliest reference. Henry, seventh baron Morley, was a semi-official translator of classics for Henry VIII. His daughter married Anne Boleyn's brother.

HENRY LORD MORLEY TO HIS POSTERITY.

Never was I lesse alone than being alone,
Here in this chamber evill thought had I none
But always I thought to bryng the mynd to rest,
And y^t thought off all thoughts I juge it the beste.
For yf my coffers hade ben full of perle & golde,
And Fortune hade favorde me then as y^t I wolde,
The mynde out of quyat, so sage Senek sethe,
It hade ben no felicitie, but a paynfull dethe.
Love then whoo love wyll to stand in hyge degre,
I blame hym not a whytte, so y^t he follow me;
And take his losse as quietly as when y^t he doth wyne,
Then Fortune hath no maistre of that state he ys in.

But rulys and ys not rulyde, & takes the better part,
O, that man is blessyd, y^t lerns this gentle arte.
Thys was my felicitie, my pastyme, & my game,
I wisse all my posteritie they wolde ensew the same.

Written over a chambar Dore where he was wont to lye
at Hollenbyrry.

This poem occurs only in Bodley ms. Ashmole 48, article 8. I copy it from the print in the *British Bibliographer*, vol. iv, p. 107. As the book is rare, the whole sixteen lines are perhaps worth reprinting.

The *Dictionary of National Biography* has an excellent account of Lord Morley (see under Parker, Henry).

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN.

Yale University.

That AS A "PRO-CONJUNCTION."

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Recently, while preparing a paper upon the "*That-Clause* in the Authorized Version of the Bible," I have found in this text nine examples wherein *that* supplants an adverbial conjunction—*because, if, except, when, and lest*—before the second of two clauses of like rank and function. This usage seems to be a compromise between the necessity for some conjunctival element before the second clause and a desire to avoid repetition. It is also interesting in connection with the formulæ *when that, if that, lest that, etc.*, which are so familiar to all readers of the older language, and which have fairly frequent exemplification even in this text, as well.

The nine examples follow, with parallels from the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Greek original:

1. *That* supplants *because*: Jer. 20. 17, "let him hear . . . the shouting at noontide. Because he slew me not from the womb; or that my mother might have been my grave" (ἀκουσάτω . . . ἀλαλαγμοῦ μεσημβρίας ὅτι οὐκ ἀπεκτείνε με ἐν μήτρῃ καὶ ἐγένετό μοι ἡ μήτηρ μου τάφος μου: qui non . . . interfecit . . . ut fieret): 1 John 2. 21, "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth" (οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἀληθείαν, ἀλλ' ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι

πάν ψεύδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστι: non scripsi vobis quod non nostis veritatem, sed quod nostis eam, et quoniam omne mendacium ex veritate non est).

2. *That* supplants *if*: Lev. 13. 31, "if the priest look on the plague of the scall, and behold it be not in sight deeper than the skin, and that there is no black hair in it, then the priest shall shut him up" (ἐὰν ἴδῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἀφὴν . . . καὶ ἴδῃ οὐχ ἡ ὄψις . . . καὶ θριξ . . . οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἀφοριεῖ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὴν ἀφὴν: sin autem viderit locum maculae aequalem vicinæ carni, et capillum nigrum: recludet eum): 1 Chron. 13. 2, "if it seem good unto you, and that it be of the Lord our God, let us send abroad" (εἰ ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἀγαθὸν καὶ παρὰ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ εὐδοθή, ἀποστείλωμεν: si placuit vobis: et a Domino Deo nostro egreditur sermo, quem loquor: mittamus): Job 31. 38, "if my land cry against me, or that the furrows likewise thereof complain" (εἰ ἐπ' ἐμοί ποτε ἡ γῆ ἐστéναξεν, εἰ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀλῶνες αὐτῆς ἐκλαυσαν: si adversum me terra mea clamat, et cum ipsa sulci ejus deflent): Jer. 33. 20, "if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season: Then may also my covenant be broken with David" (Septuagint fails: si irritum potest fieri pactum meum cum die, et pactum meum cum nocte, ut non sit dies et nox in tempore suo: et pactum meum irritum esse poterit cum David).

3. *That* supplants *except*: Esther 2. 14, "she came in unto the king no more, except the king delighted in her, and that she were called by name" (οὐκ ἔτι εἰσπορεύεται πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ἐὰν μὴ κληθῇ ὀνόματι: nec habebat potestatem ad regem ultra redeundi, nisi prius voluisset rex, et eam venire jussisset ex nomine).

4. *That* supplants *when*: Num. 9. 21, "and so it was, when the cloud abode from even unto the morning, and that the cloud was taken up in the morning, then they journeyed" (καὶ ἔσται ὅταν γένηται ἡ νεφέλη ἀφ' ἑσπέρας ἕως πρωῆ, καὶ ἀναβῇ ἡ νεφέλη τὸ πρωῆ, καὶ ἀπαροῦσιν ἡμέρας ἡ νυκτός: si fuisset nubes a vespere usque mane, et statim diluculo tabernaculum reliquisset, profiscerantur).

5. *That* supplants *lest*: 2 Cor. 12. 20, "for I fear, lest, when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you

such as ye would not" (φοβοῦμαι γὰρ, μὴ πως
ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἷους θέλω, εἶρω ὑμᾶς, καὶ γὰρ εὐρεθῶ ὑμῖν
οἷον οὐ θέλετε: timeo enim ne forte veniens non
quales volo inveniam vos: et ego inveniar a vobis
qualem non vultis).

HUBERT G. SHEARIN.

Transylvania University.

CHAUCER AND *Sir Aldingar*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—To Mr. Lincoln R. Gibbs's interesting list of parallel passages supporting Professor Liddell's interpretation of Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*, vv. 975-977, printed in your November issue, may be added the following fairly close parallel from the ballad of *Sir Aldingar* (Child's Collection, no. 59, A, stanza 43).

"The litte one pulld forth a well good sword,
I-wis itt was all of guilt;
It cast light there over that feild,
It shone soe all of guilt."

This appearance of the idea in popular poetry shows that to the mind of the people it did not seem too violent an exaggeration. But to Bishop Percy it evidently appeared strained, as the similar conception in Chaucer has seemed to his editors, for in polishing this ballad for his *Reliques*, the Bishop altered the passage to the following more colorless and commonplace form.

"The boye pulld forth a well good sworde,
So gilt it dazzled the ee."
(*Reliques*, ed. Wheatley, vol. II, p. 60.)

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

A NOTE ON SPEECH MELODY.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—I desire to call attention to the striking rhythmical quality to be observed in the prose of Wilhelm Hesse, the author of *Peter Camenzind*, and one of the leading novelists of Germany today. In trying, casually, to ascertain the personal rhythm of this author, with the much discussed theory of Eduard Sievers in mind, I caught myself in a hardly more than semi-conscious attempt to read as if I were scanning dactylic hexameter. After that, of course, the effort became fully conscious; curiously enough, I had little trouble in producing (by means of moderate slurring) the general effect of hexameters, nay sometimes of elegiac meter, as e. g., p. 205:

Leider hat sich gezeigt, dass der kleine Mattheo Spinelli
wirklich, wie ich stets gesagt habe, ein Bösewicht ist.

I need hardly say that but few lines in the novel permit of absolute scansion. I am merely pointing out the odd phenomenon of a dactylic type of personal prose rhythm in a German writer, without drawing any of the self-suggesting inferences. Probably for the specimens of perfect distichs we should have to assume intentional versification, as when we come to lines like the following:

Feierlich schwiegen umher die silbrig umdünsteten Berge,
der fast völlige Mond hing in der bläulichen Nacht.

In such cases we are merely left to wonder at the adoption, by a modern of moderns, of the old-fashioned Dickensian device.

OTTO HELLER.

Washington University, St. Louis.

THE METER OF COLLINS'S *Ode to Evening*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—It is commonly said that Collins derived the meter of his *Ode to Evening* from Milton's translation of the fifth ode of the first book of Horace. That there is some connection between the two poems seems almost certain since they are written in the same unrimed form which is not blank verse and is very rare in English. The only difference is that the later ode is divided into stanzas. Furthermore, Collins drew the structure, meter, and phrasing of other poems from Milton and borrowed expressions from him in this ode.¹ There is good reason, however, for thinking that the stanza of *The Ode to Evening* is derived, not directly from Milton, but thru some of the latter's imitators.

The first person after Milton to use this stanza seems to have been Thomas Warton, Senior. In a volume of his poems published in 1745, three years after his death, was included an *Ode to Taste* in the meter of Milton's translation. Like it, the ode was not divided into stanzas, Thomas Warton, Junior, the author of the *History of English Poetry*, also made two translations from Horace "After the Manner of Milton" the date of neither the composition nor the publication of which have I been able to discover. These two translations are divided into stanzas.

Between May, 1745 and June, 1746,² Joseph

¹ Or where the beetle winds
His small but sullen horn. 11-12.
What time the grey-fly winds her sultry horn.
Lycidas, 28.
Or upland fallows grey. 31.
Russet lawns, and fallows gray . . .
The upland hamlets will invite. *L'Allegro*, 71, 92.

² John Woll's *Biographical Memoirs of Joseph Warton*, L, 1806, p. 14, n. For the date cf. *Athenaeum Press*, Collins, p. xx, n.

Warton wrote to his brother Thomas, "Collins met me in Surrey, at Guildford races, when I wrote out for him my odes, and he like wise communicated some of his to me; and being both in very high spirits we took courage, resolved to join our forces and to publish them immediately." In December, 1746, at least six months after this meeting occurred, the two poets published their work separately. Warton's eighth poem is *To a Fountain. Imitated from Horace, Ode XIII, Book III*. The fact that this is in the meter of Milton's translation and that it is a paraphrase of an ode by the same Latin author, makes clear the debt to the Puritan poet.³ Yet the idea of employing this form was in all probability suggested by the previous use of it by Warton's father. This is the more likely because the recent death of the latter and the possibility that the son was collecting his verses for publication at the time he made the paraphrase. Collins's volume contained the *Ode to Evening*. Collins must have known Milton's translation and was doubtless more or less influenced by it in his choice of the meter for his ode. Milton's poem is certainly much more likely to inspire imitation than those of the Wartons. Yet the idea of employing this meter was, in all probability, suggested to him thru the use of it by the Warton family. Collins was a schoolmate of Joseph's, and, from the letter quoted, it is apparent that the two remained good friends. It is quite likely that Collins came to know the *Ode to Taste* of his friend's father while he and Joseph were at Winchester or later when they were at Oxford. *The Ode to Taste*, which is somewhat similar to *The Ode to Evening* may well have suggested to Collins the idea of using Milton's unrimed stanza for his great lyric. The hint may have come, however, from hearing Joseph Warton read his poems at Guildford races, or from Thomas Warton Junior's translations—in which as in *The Ode to Evening* the stanzas are separated—or from all three.

The appearance of this very unusual meter in two volumes of verse published the same month by two friends can scarcely be a coincidence; Joseph Warton's use of it can easily be explained; it seems almost certain, therefore, that the idea of employing it came to Collins from some member of the Warton family.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

Rochester, New York.

³ To be sure, this is also the meter of the original and accordingly might seem to be the most natural one to employ, but an examination of other translations and of one's own experience in this line will, I think, make clear that a metrical translation of an ode is naturally rimed. It will be remembered that Marvell's *Horatian Ode on Cromwell's Return* is in this same meter and is rimed. Furthermore, in view of the use of the same very rare meter by his father and brother and their derivation of it from Milton, there is every reason for thinking that Joseph Warton got it from the same source.

LORD BYRON'S *Stanzas to the Po* AGAIN.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Some days after reading the proofs of my communication to the last number of this journal (December, 1909), I observed in Richard Edgcumbe's recent book, *Byron: The Last Phase*, p. 299, the suggestion that the *Stanzas to the Po* "were adapted, from a fragment written in early life, to meet the conditions of 1819," and that Byron, in composing these lines, really had in mind not the Countess Guiccioli, but Mary Chaworth (with whom, as appears from Mr. Edgcumbe's work, the poet maintained a hitherto unsuspected intimacy in 1813), then (1819) residing at Colwick Hall on the Trent. This suggestion that the poem is an adaptation of an earlier one is rather striking, in view of the fact that Mr. Edgcumbe was writing without knowledge of the passage in Moore's *Journal* to which I have called attention, but it is left unsupported by proofs, for the detailed argument which follows is devoted to the second of the points just mentioned. If Mr. Edgcumbe, however, can establish this second point—namely, that the *Stanzas to the Po*, though ostensibly addressed to the Countess Guiccioli, were really meant to apply to Mary Chaworth—it would undoubtedly strengthen the probability, suggested by the passage in Moore's *Journal*, that the poem represents a recasting of an earlier piece (addressed to Mary Chaworth). It is accordingly worth while, perhaps, to examine his argument on this point.

It may be said at the outset that the theory is, in itself, not a very likely one. Byron had been on terms (it would seem) of the last intimacy with both of the women concerned—with Mary Chaworth in 1813 and with the Countess Guiccioli in 1819. In the latter year, according to the theory, he sits down and composes these fine lines to the Italian countess—Mr. Edgcumbe does not dispute that they are primarily addressed to her—but in composing them has his mind so full of his profounder love for Mary Chaworth that he slips in phrases that apply to the latter and not to the former—for it is to be noted that Mr. Edgcumbe does not assign these phrases (which we shall soon examine) to the hypothetical fragment, but takes them as a part of the poem as written in 1819. It is rather curious, one may remark in passing, that with his theory regarding the stanzas, Mr. Edgcumbe did not try to prove that the phrases in question belonged to the hypothetical fragment.

But let us examine the argument in detail. Mr. Edgcumbe's main point is that the italicized lines in the following (the first) stanza accord well with Byron's relations to Mary Chaworth in June, 1819, but do not accord with his relations

to the Countess Guiccioli at that time, inasmuch as he had parted with the Countess only two months before, was in constant correspondence with her, and expected to visit her at Ravenna very soon again. (For reasons which he does not state, Mr. Edgcumbe assumes throughout that the poem was written in June rather than April, 1819). This is the (first) stanza:

River that rollest by the ancient walls
Where dwells the Lady of my love, when she
Walks by thy brink, and there perchance recalls
A faint and fleeting memory of me.

If we take the italicized words *au pied de lettre*, Mr. Edgcumbe's contention is doubtless true, but when all the rest of the poem fits perfectly well with the Guiccioli—notice especially the references to the fact that the poet and the lady were born in different climates—are we justified in drawing the inference that he does? There is surely nothing unnatural in a poet's expressing in a love-poem a greater fear as to the place he holds in the memory of his absent mistress than he really feels.

Again, Mr. Edgcumbe objects to the following stanza (the seventh in the poem but transposed by him so as to be the second), that "while there was nothing whatever to connect the River Po with tender recollections, there was Byron's association in childhood with the River Trent, a memory inseparable from his boyish love for Mary Chaworth":

She will look on thee—I have looked on thee
Full of that thought: and from that moment ne'er
Thy waters could I dream of, name, or see
Without the inseparable sigh for her!

But there is no question of *old* associations here. Even if we hold him down to a rigid literalness of statement, it is sufficient that the poet should have looked on the river on some occasion, with thoughts of his mistress in his mind, and the lines would be justified.

Lastly, the line "The thousand thoughts *I now betray to thee*" (i. e., the river), surely has no more significance as applied to Mary Chaworth than to the Guiccioli—for Byron had just as much reason to be reticent about his feelings in regard to the one as the other.

Most readers, I believe, will acknowledge that Mr. Edgcumbe's argument furnishes very slender support for his theory. Whether, however, Byron really wrote a similar poem at an earlier period does not, of course, stand or fall with this argument. Perhaps some day evidence may turn up to show that he did write such a poem. In the meanwhile I think that the explanation I have offered of the passage in Moore's *Journal* is the

most likely one. In any event, however, it is a striking coincidence that Mr. Edgcumbe and myself should have independently and about the same time raised the question (which has never been raised before) as to the existence of an earlier poem by Byron corresponding to his *Stanzas to the Po*—he on the basis of internal evidence, I on the basis of external. To be sure, our answers are different, his being in the affirmative, mine in the negative.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

University of Tennessee.

ERNESTO GARCIA LADEVÈSE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—On page 164 of Prof. E. C. Hills' excellent edition of *Spanish Tales for Beginners*, published by Holt and Co., the name of Ernesto García Ladevèse, author of the story *Pescador de Caña*, is followed by an interrogation mark, indicating that the editor was unable to find any biographical notes concerning him. A short account of his life and also his photograph are appended to an article on the Republican party in Spain which he contributed to *L'Espagne, politique, littérature, etc., numéro spécial encyclopédique de la Nouvelle Revue Internationale*, Paris, 1900, p. 56. The sketch of his life there given is as follows:—

Ernesto García Ladevèse est né près de Bilbao le 2 juin 1850. Presque adolescent, il publia divers recueils de poésies dont *Feu et Cendres*, *Les vagues*, et quelques romans. Lorsque la Révolution de 1868 éclata, il commençait ses études de droit à Madrid et fut élu président de l'Association d'étudiants démocrates. Lieutenant de Ruiz Zorrilla, il suivit ce dernier dans sa lutte révolutionnaire et dans son exil. Amnistié, en mars 1895, il fut salué par de grandes ovations populaires à Tolosa et à Bilbao. Au meeting du 29 septembre 1899 à Madrid, il prononça un discours retentissant.

Ladevèse est un habile avocat et un littérateur distingué. Son dernier roman, *L'Idole*, a eu un vif succès, et les contes qu'il publie dans *L'Illustration espagnole* et dans le *Liberal* sont très appréciés. Pendant son exil, Ladevèse a collaboré à plusieurs journaux français.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.